

bulletin

VOL. XV, NO. 225
November 22, 1946

THE TREATY OF AMITY, COMMERCE AND CONSULAR RIGHTS
BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE
REPUBLIC OF CHINA

THE TREATY OF AMITY, COMMERCE AND CONSULAR RIGHTS
BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE
REPUBLIC OF CHINA

THE TREATY OF AMITY, COMMERCE AND CONSULAR RIGHTS
BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE
REPUBLIC OF CHINA



For sale by the Superintendent of Documents



The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XV, No. 385 · PUBLICATION 2694

November 17, 1946

Contributors

Duncan Wall, author of the article on the FAO Copenhagen Conference and the FAO Preparatory Commission, was Secretary to the American Delegation to the FAO Conference at Copenhagen. Mr. Wall is head of the Division of Foreign Information and Statistics, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, Department of Agriculture.

Stephen Latchford, author of the article on private international air law, is Aviation Adviser, Aviation Division, Office of Transport and Communications, Department of State, and chairman of the United States section of CITEJA. Mr. Latchford was an adviser to the United States delegation to the First Interim Assembly of PICAQ held at Montreal in May and June 1946.

J. Paul Barringer, author of the article on the recent PICAQ Conference on North Atlantic Ocean Weather Observation Stations, is Assistant Chief, Aviation Division, Office of Transport and Communications, Department of State, and he was American delegate to the PICAQ conference.

George A. Morlock, author of the article on control of dangerous drugs, is Chief of the Narcotics Section, Division of International Labor, Social and Health Affairs, Office of International Trade Policy, Department of State.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U. S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D. C.

SUBSCRIPTION:
52 issues, \$3.50; single copy, 10 cents

Special offer: 13 weeks for \$1.00
(renewable only on yearly basis)

Published with the approval of the
Director of the Bureau of the Budget

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest is included.

Publications of the Department, cumulative lists of which are published at the end of each quarter, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

P.R.R.

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

11-29-46

PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL AIR LAW DEVELOPMENTS

by Stephen Latchford

The principal topics discussed by the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts in July 1946 were as follows: air-carrier liability for damages to persons and property; recordation of title to aircraft and aircraft mortgages; and legal status of aircraft personnel and commander. This article explains views of the United States Government on merging of CITEJA activities into functions of the committee on international air law provided for by the First Assembly of PICAQ.

The First, Third, and Fourth Commissions of CITEJA met in Paris in July 1946. The purpose of these CITEJA¹ meetings was to make preparations for the sessions of CITEJA held in Cairo, Egypt, in November 1946. The CITEJA commissions met at Cairo beginning on November 6, and the fifteenth plenary session of CITEJA began on November 14 and was scheduled to last until November 19. The following countries were represented at the July 1946 sessions in Paris: United States, Belgium, Egypt, Finland, France, United Kingdom, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, Switzerland, and Czechoslovakia. In addition to the president of the CITEJA, J. P. Niboyet, and the secretary general, Edmond Sudre, there was a total of 28 representatives of the countries listed.

The following persons attended the CITEJA sessions in July as observers: Albert Roper, who is at present the secretary general of both the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization (PICAQ)—provided for in the interim agreement on international civil aviation adopted at Chicago on December 7, 1944—and of the International Commission for Air Navigation (ICAN)—functioning under the international convention for the regulation of aerial navigation adopted at Paris on October 13, 1919; and Eugene Pepin, chief of the Legal Studies Section of the Air Transport Bureau of the secretariat of PICAQ.

¹ Comité International Technique d'Experts Juridiques Aériens, an international drafting committee composed of air-law experts.

The United States delegation at the sessions of CITEJA in July of this year consisted of Arnold W. Knauth of the Department of Justice, specialist in shipping and aviation law; J. Brooks B. Parker of Philadelphia, specialist in insurance matters, and Paul Reiber of the Air Transport Association of America.

At the July 1946 sessions the First Commission of CITEJA had under consideration a proposed international convention on the recordation of title to aircraft and aircraft mortgages, the purpose of which is to facilitate dealing in and financing of aircraft engaged in international air navigation. In 1931 the CITEJA adopted provisionally two separate draft conventions, one dealing with the recordation of title to aircraft and the other with aircraft mortgages. After the Chicago civil aviation conference of 1944 was held, the Government of the United States made inquiries of various governments as to whether they would authorize signature in Washington of two conventions, one relating to the recordation of title to aircraft and the other to aircraft mortgages. The drafts circulated by the Government of the United States contained a few suggested modifications of the CITEJA 1931 drafts. However, no definite action was taken in the matter of signing the two drafts proposed by this Government. At its fourteenth plenary session held in Paris in January 1946, the CITEJA decided to transmit its two 1931 drafts to the PICAQ for consideration by the First Interim Assembly of PICAQ, which met at Montreal in May 1946.²

During the sessions of the legal commission of the First Interim Assembly at Montreal a number of difficulties arose in the matter of endeavoring to reconcile conflicting principles of national laws concerning the form and effect of aircraft mort-

gages. The legal commission prepared the text of a combined draft convention dealing with the recordation of title to aircraft and aircraft mortgages, after having given consideration to the two CITEJA 1931 drafts and the modifications thereof which had been suggested by the Government of the United States and by the representatives of other governments. The Assembly adopted a resolution requesting the various governments, the CITEJA, and other interested parties, to submit comments on this combined draft to the Interim Council of PICAQ by January 1, 1947. It is understood that these comments will be considered by the Interim Council with a view to preparing a report on the problems involved for submission to the Second Assembly.

Briefly, the proposed convention on recordation of title and aircraft mortgages as developed at Montreal provides for the recording by each contracting state in a national aircraft property record of title to aircraft, and establishes the form and effect of aircraft mortgages and other similar encumbrances recorded in the aircraft property record, with a view to having such titles and mortgages accorded recognition in other contracting states. At its July 1946 sessions the CITEJA appointed reporters to make a study of the draft developed at Montreal, for the purpose of facilitating the taking of appropriate action thereon at the November 1946 sessions of CITEJA in Cairo, Egypt.

The First Commission of CITEJA also had under consideration in July 1946 a proposed convention dealing with the liability of air-transport operators in the event of aerial collisions. The CITEJA adopted a draft convention on this subject at its eleventh plenary session at Bern, Switzerland, in September 1936. This draft was submitted to the Fourth International Conference on Private International Air Law at Brussels in September 1938. The American delegation to the Brussels conference took the position that a convention on aerial collisions would be premature and that any definite action on the subject should be postponed until ample opportunity had been afforded to examine, in the light of experience, the many problems involved in aerial collisions and

² Prior to the outbreak of the war, final action on CITEJA projects was taken at periodic international conferences on private international air law, but they are now submitted by CITEJA to the International Civil Aviation Organization at Montreal for consideration and possible final adoption and signature at the Assembly meetings of that Organization, in accordance with a resolution adopted by the Interim Council of PICAQ and agreed to by CITEJA.

their complex ramifications. The American delegation at Brussels submitted numerous proposals concerning the CITEJA draft convention for the consideration of the Brussels conference in the event that it should decide to take action on the CITEJA project. However, the conference at Brussels adopted a resolution referring the CITEJA draft back to CITEJA for further consideration along with the proposals on the draft submitted by several delegations at the Brussels conference.³ The resolution stated that this action was taken because of the multiplicity of proposals on the CITEJA draft submitted at Brussels and the lack of time available to undertake a careful examination of the project. The CITEJA draft set forth the conditions under which operators of aircraft might claim a limitation of liability in the event of aerial collisions; provided for a method of apportioning damage awards between passengers and property, and of apportioning damages between the operators of collided aircraft in the event of concurrent negligence; and set forth the conditions under which the operators of collided aircraft would be liable for damages caused on the surface as the result of aerial collisions.

It is understood that while the experts attending the CITEJA sessions in July 1946 felt that some progress should be made in the development of a proposed convention on aerial collisions they did not feel that the matter was urgent. A number of the proposals made by the American delegation at Brussels in September 1938 were adopted at the CITEJA sessions in July 1946. As the result of the discussions in July of this year a new text was prepared by the reporter for this subject, for consideration at the CITEJA sessions in Cairo in November 1946.

The Second Commission of CITEJA, which met in Paris in July 1946, had under consideration the proposed revision of the convention for the unification of certain rules relating to international transportation by air, signed at Warsaw on October 12, 1929. This convention sets forth the conditions under which the air-transport operator will be liable for damages to persons and property in international transportation and permits the

operator to claim a limitation of his liability under the conditions set forth in the convention. The convention also contains detailed provisions as to the form and effect of air-transport documents consisting of passenger tickets, baggage checks, and air waybills. The United States and many other countries are parties to this convention.⁴

During the CITEJA sessions in Paris in January 1946 the Second Commission adopted a number of proposed amendments to the Warsaw convention, most of which were of a clarifying nature. The CITEJA referred its proposals to the PICAQ at Montreal for the consideration of the First Interim Assembly of PICAQ. The First Assembly adopted a resolution referring the CITEJA proposals back to CITEJA for further study with a view to considering the need of a more complete and extensive revision of the convention. One of the results of the discussion of the Warsaw convention by the CITEJA in July 1946 was the preparation of a questionnaire containing a number of questions to be answered by the CITEJA experts in order to aid the reporter for this subject in preparing a text for consideration by CITEJA at its sessions in Cairo in November 1946. The resolution of the First Interim Assembly regarding the Warsaw convention provides for a study by the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization at Montreal of any proposals for the amendment of the convention that might be adopted by the CITEJA in Cairo in November 1946 and of any comments on the subject which the Interim Council of PICAQ may receive from interested governments and other sources, with a view to determining the extent to which the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organiza-

³For a discussion regarding the action taken on the CITEJA draft at the Brussels conference, see report of the American Delegation to that conference (Department of State publication 1401, Conference Series 42, p. 16). For the text of the CITEJA draft which was before the Brussels conference, see the Report of the American Delegation to the Fourth International Conference on Private Air Law, p. 48. This was a diplomatic conference to which the various governments sent officially accredited delegates.

⁴Treaty Series 876.

tion may be disposed to submit proposals for the revision of the convention to the meeting of the Assembly of that organization in 1947.

At the July 1946 sessions of CITEJA the Fourth Commission had under consideration a proposed convention dealing with the legal status of the aircraft navigating personnel and of the aircraft commander. In 1931 the CITEJA adopted provisionally a proposed convention dealing with the legal status of the aircraft commander. Since that time, and over a period of several years, it has given consideration to the adoption of a proposed convention on the legal status of the aircraft navigating personnel. As directed by the CITEJA at its sessions in January 1946, the reporter prepared for consideration in July of this year a single text dealing with both the navigating personnel and the commander. The draft submitted by the reporter to the July 1946 sessions of the CITEJA so far as it related to the navigating personnel contained the basic principles regarding the form and effect of the contract of employment of the personnel and the conditions under which they would be entitled to repatriation, which had appeared in previous CITEJA drafts. The portions of the project submitted to the July sessions that dealt with the aircraft commander contained certain basic principles of the CITEJA 1931 draft which vested the commander with certain powers of safety, discipline, and authority on board the aircraft and set forth the conditions under which he could bind his principal in incurring necessary expenses for safeguarding the persons and property carried on the aircraft.

The general sentiment among the members of the United States section of the CITEJA at this time is to favor the development of a proposed convention dealing solely with the status of the aircraft commander. The United States members feel that the combined draft presented at the July 1946 sessions of CITEJA contains provisions regarding the contract of employment that might interfere with the freedom of contract between the members of the navigating personnel and the operators of aircraft. The members of the United States section are, therefore, in favor of having the CITEJA again deal with the general subject on the basis of two separate drafts, one relating

to the status of the navigating personnel and the other to the status of the commander of the aircraft, so as to facilitate the action of interested governments in becoming a party to one of the conventions but not the other, if they so desire. The CITEJA reporter who presented the combined draft at the July 1946 sessions of the CITEJA has indicated that he will present two separate drafts at the sessions of the CITEJA in Cairo in November of this year if the CITEJA then decides to have this done.

The discussions at the July 1946 sessions of the CITEJA were devoted chiefly to the projects of the First, Second, and Fourth Commissions described above. Other subjects on the agenda were as follows: relation between CITEJA and PICA; arbitration functions proposed for the CITEJA; aviation insurance; general average (similar to the maritime doctrine where there is an adjustment of voluntary sacrifices of property on board for the preservation of the vessel); hiring and chartering of aircraft; postal salvage; global or over-all limitation of liability (accumulation of liability of the aircraft operator where in a single instance the operator may be found to be liable for damages under two or more conventions); abandonment (similar to the maritime practice where a damaged vessel is abandoned by the owner for the benefit of creditors); authority of foreign judgments (involving the extent to which courts of the various countries would enforce foreign judgments obtained under the provisions of private air-law conventions); and tourist aviation (facilitation of tourist traffic by privately owned aircraft).

The questions which were on the agenda for the July 1946 sessions of the CITEJA have been given further consideration at the sessions of the CITEJA in Cairo in November 1946. The secretary general of CITEJA announced that the subjects which would be given priority for consideration when the CITEJA met in plenary session at Cairo on November 14, 1946 are: the relations between CITEJA and PICA; the revision of the Warsaw convention of 1929; the legal status of the aircraft navigating personnel and the commander of the aircraft; and the proposed convention relating to the recordation of title to aircraft and

aircraft mortgages. It is expected that any draft conventions adopted by CITEJA in plenary session at Cairo will be referred to the PICAQ for consideration at the next Assembly meeting of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

The relation between CITEJA and PICAQ is a matter of special importance in that it relates to Resolution XXXI of the First Interim Assembly at Montreal providing for the organization of a permanent committee on international air law to be established on the authority of the Assembly of the permanent International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) which will succeed the PICAQ and function under the terms of the convention on international civil aviation adopted at Chicago on December 7, 1944, after that convention comes into force. The text of Resolution XXXI of the First Interim Assembly is as follows:

Means by which PICAQ should, in future, deal with legal problems

Resolved:

1. That in setting up the Permanent Organization provision should be made for the establishment, on the authority of its Assembly, as part of the Permanent Organization, and responsible to the Council, of a Permanent Committee on International Air Law with the functions to:

(a) study and prepare draft conventions leading progressively to the unification of International Air Law;

(b) advise on questions relating to International Air Law submitted to it by the Permanent Organization;

(c) collect legislative, administrative and legal information concerning International Air Law and transmit this information to the Secretariat of the Permanent Organization for communication to member States.

2. That the date and method of establishment of the Legal Committee and its functioning be fixed by the Council after consultation with the Secretary General of the CITEJA, and that in the functioning of this Committee with respect to International Private Air Law matters, there shall be taken into account the experience of the

CITEJA in its formation, organization and its Secretariat in order that the advantages thereof may be preserved.

3. That any member State so desiring shall have the right to appoint one or more representatives on such Committee and that the member States whose nominees are now members of the CITEJA be requested to place at the disposal of such Committee the expert personnel previously made available by them to the CITEJA together with all reports in the course of preparation or study by such expert personnel.

4. That the CITEJA be invited to place at the disposal of the said Committee its records and archives and any secretarial staff suitable for employment by the Organization.

5. That the Interim Council undertake as soon as possible the necessary planning for the establishment of a Legal Committee in the Permanent Organization, and to that end that the Interim Council be authorized to consult with the Secretary General of the CITEJA.

6. That, in view of the above decisions, the Assembly consider that no action is required concerning the draft conventions mentioned under No. 2 (f), (g) and (h) of the Agenda of Commission No. 4.⁵

In connection with the November 1946 sessions of CITEJA, the Secretary General of CITEJA requested the CITEJA experts to obtain from their governments replies to three questions concerning the future status of CITEJA. These questions are as follows:

1. Does your government consider that, in conformity with the resolution adopted by the General Assembly of PICAQ on June 8, 1946, it is necessary to accept the transfer of the experts, reports, archives and personnel of the Secretariat

⁵“(f) CITEJA draft convention on the status of the CITEJA;

“(g) CITEJA draft convention on the interpretation by CITEJA of the conventions and rules on Private Air Law;

“(h) CITEJA draft convention entrusting CITEJA with the preparation of measures to implement conventions on Private Air Law.”

[NOTE. Commission No. 4 mentioned in paragraph 6 of Resolution XXXI of the First Interim Assembly was a commission dealing with legal questions and constituted a part of the organization of the First Interim Assembly.]

General of CITEJA to the committee to be "established on the authority of the General Assembly of PICAQ, as part of PICAQ, and responsible to the Council of PICAQ", which will be called the "Permanent Committee on International Air Law"?

2. Does your government consider that the conclusions which follow from the above-cited resolution as it was adopted by PICAQ are: the method of organization of the committee, of assembling, meeting and study, now in effect in the CITEJA, as well as the present staff, should be preserved by the "Permanent Committee on International Air Law"?

3. Given the very delimited and strictly defined field of activity laid down by the above-mentioned resolution for the Permanent Committee on International Air Law as follows:

(a) Preparation of draft international conventions on air law;

(b) Advice upon and answers to questions submitted by the PICAQ;

(c) Collection of legislative, legal and administrative documents concerning international air law;

does your government consider that, from the practical and political point of view, it would be more productive and financially less expensive to allow the CITEJA a certain functional autonomy and, consequently, to continue the headquarters of the CITEJA, thus transformed, at the place fixed by unanimous decision of the governments twenty years ago?

The reply of the Government of the United States to the three questions quoted above, as communicated to the Secretary General through the American Embassy at Paris and as covered in the instructions given by the Department of State to the chairman of the United States delegation to the CITEJA sessions in Cairo in November of this year, follows:

*See article by Mr. Latchford entitled "Coordination of CITEJA With the New International Civil-Aviation Organizations", BULLETIN of Feb. 25, 1945, p. 310. See also articles by Mr. Latchford entitled "Private International Air Law", BULLETIN of Jan. 7, 1945, p. 11, and "Private International Air Law: 14th Plenary Session of CITEJA" (a description of CITEJA meetings held in Paris in January 1946), BULLETIN of May 19, 1946, p. 835.

"(1) So far as concerns the matter of the transfer of experts to the new Legal Committee, the attention of the Secretary General is invited to paragraph 3 of Resolution XXXI of the First Assembly of PICAQ from which it is believed to be clear that States members of the International Civil Aviation Organization will be free to appoint either CITEJA members on the new Legal Committee or to designate other experts. So far as concerns the transfer of CITEJA reports, archives, and personnel of the Secretariat General of CITEJA, it is assumed that this would be one of the details entering into the discussions between the Interim Council at Montreal and the Secretary General of CITEJA, as provided for in paragraph 5 of Resolution XXXI of the First Assembly of PICAQ. However, so far as concerns the Government of the United States, it would interpose no objection to such transfer. In connection with the reply to question 1, it is the understanding of the Government of the United States that it was contemplated by Resolution XXXI of the First Assembly of PICAQ that upon the organization of the new Legal Committee, in accordance with the terms of that resolution (pars. 2, 3 and 4), the CITEJA would as a consequence cease to exist.

"(2) The answer of the Government of the United States to question 2 is in the negative. The attention of the Secretary General of CITEJA is invited to paragraph 2 of Resolution XXXI of the First Assembly of PICAQ. While this paragraph contemplates that the experience of the CITEJA in its formation, organization and its Secretariat should be taken into consideration in the functioning of the new Legal Committee, it does not necessarily follow that the present organization of CITEJA would be continued within the framework of the new Legal Committee.

"(3) The answer of the Government of the United States to question 3 is in the negative. In setting forth this position, the Government of the United States feels that allowing a certain degree of autonomy to CITEJA would be inconsistent with the provisions of Resolution XXXI of the First Assembly of PICAQ providing for the setting up of a Legal Committee to deal with questions within the fields of both public and private international air law."

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF DANGEROUS DRUGS

Preview of Commission on Narcotic Drugs

by George A. Morlock

The Economic and Social Council of the United Nations has set up a Commission on Narcotic Drugs in order to provide machinery whereby full effect may be given to the international conventions relating to narcotic drugs and to provide for continuous review of and progress in the international control of such drugs.

The first session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, is scheduled to be held at New York beginning November 27, 1946. It is expected that the representatives of 15 governments will be present to review the world situation regarding narcotic drugs and to report to the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations on the fulfilment by the parties to the international drug conventions of their obligations under those conventions.¹ The United States has designated Harry J. Anslinger, Commissioner of Narcotics, Treasury Department, to serve in this capacity.

The Commission had its inception when the American Delegation to the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco in 1945 made the following declaration² in regard to the organization of international cooperation for the suppression of the abuse of narcotic drugs:

" . . . Experience has shown that drug control raises issues which can best be met not by an international health, economic or social agency, but by the type of specialized agencies now functioning so successfully in this field. Everything pos-

sible should be done to safeguard the continued operation of these agencies and services.

"The United States Delegation wishes to go on record as hoping that the Organization will be entrusted with supervision over the execution of existing or future international agreements with regard to the control of the legitimate traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs, and the suppression of illicit traffic in and abuse of such drugs; that there shall be established an advisory body to advise directly the Economic and Social Council on these matters; and that the existing agencies be regarded as autonomous agencies to be related directly to the Economic and Social Council".

¹ For article on "International Bodies for Narcotics Control", by Philip M. Burnett, see BULLETIN of Oct. 14, 1945, p. 570. For article on "Limitation of the Production of Opium", by Mr. Morlock, see BULLETIN of Dec. 10, 1944, p. 723. For subsequent exchange of notes between U.S. and Afghanistan concerning proposed convention to discuss world limitation of opium production, see BULLETIN of Dec. 10, 1944, p. 725; for similar exchange with Mexico, see BULLETIN of May 13, 1945, p. 911; with Turkey, see BULLETIN of July 8, 1945, p. 63; with Soviet Union, see BULLETIN of July 22, 1945, p. 129; with United Kingdom concerning India, see BULLETIN of Feb. 17, 1946, p. 237.

² Report to the President on the Results of the San Francisco Conference, p. 122.

The American Delegation was anxious to arrange for the continued functioning of the principal narcotics control bodies after the dissolution of the League of Nations: the Permanent Central Opium Board was established by the Geneva drug convention of 1925 to watch over and control the course of the legitimate trade in narcotic drugs; and the Drug Supervisory Body was established by the narcotics limitation convention of 1931 to draw up an annual statement of the requirements of all countries and territories for narcotic drugs. These bodies would normally continue to exist after the liquidation of the League provided they were brought into relation with the United Nations. The situation of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs, however, was different. This Committee, usually referred to as the Opium Advisory Committee, was established by a resolution¹ of the Assembly of the League of Nations on December 15, 1920, for the purpose of exercising general supervision over the execution of existing and future narcotics conventions. It was, therefore, an organ of the League of Nations and would cease to exist simultaneously with the League. Although the United States never accepted full membership, it sent a representative to the sessions of the Committee after 1923, who served in an expert and in an advisory capacity. The United States regarded the work of the Committee as valuable and necessary to the control of the international traffic in narcotic drugs. The American Delegation was accordingly authorized to express the hope that there would be created an advisory body for assisting the Economic and Social Council on matters relating to narcotics.

The Opium Advisory Committee held 25 sessions, beginning in 1921 and ending in 1940. At each session important recommendations were made regarding the control of the legitimate traffic and the suppression of the illicit traffic. Listed below are some of the more outstanding accomplishments of the Committee:

1. It induced nearly all of the countries of the world not already party to the international drug convention signed at The Hague on January 23, 1912 to adhere to that convention.

¹ Assembly Document 240, Resolution No. 18, Dec. 15, 1920.

2. It urged the establishment of a control body and worked out an import-export certificate system to be applied to all imports and exports of opium and other narcotic drugs. Together they constitute the heart of the control machinery. These recommendations were incorporated into the international drug convention signed at Geneva on February 19, 1925.

3. It drew up a model code and recommended it to all countries of the world for their guidance in the preparation of narcotic laws and the development of control organizations.

4. It made studies concerning the problem of the limitation of the manufacture and the regulation of the distribution of narcotic drugs and recommended a control system based on estimates furnished by country requirements, which was incorporated into the narcotics limitation convention signed at Geneva on July 13, 1931.

5. It prepared the ground for the convention for the suppression of the illicit traffic in dangerous drugs which was signed at Geneva on June 26, 1936. This convention contains many important provisions relating to the prevention and punishment of illicit drug trafficking.

6. It prepared a draft of a convention for limiting the production of raw opium and made studies of the problem of limiting the production of other raw materials used in the manufacture of narcotic drugs.

The Permanent Central Opium Board and the Drug Supervisory Body were created also as a result of the recommendations of the Committee, and the countries of the world were requested to furnish estimates to the Board of their drug requirements and statistical reports on imports, exports, consumption, production, manufacture, stocks, and confiscations. In order to comply with the provisions of the conventions, countries found it advisable to improve and make uniform their laws governing the control of narcotic drugs. The Committee also drew up a form of annual report to be submitted by governments on the working of the narcotics limitation convention in their territories. Facts and figures are now available regarding the drug traffic where none existed before.

The Preparatory Commission of the United Nations, meeting in London in December 1945, in

order to arrange for the creation of a successor to the Opium Advisory Committee and to give full effect to the narcotics conventions, accepted a proposal presented by the Chinese Delegation, which recommended that the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations establish a Commission on Narcotic Drugs.¹

On February 18, 1946 that proposed Commission was created by the Economic and Social Council, after adopting the following resolution,² which constitutes the terms of reference of the Commission:

1. The Economic and Social Council, in order to provide machinery whereby full effect may be given to the international conventions relating to narcotic drugs, and to provide for continuous review of and progress in the international control of such drugs, establishes a Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

2. The Commission shall:

(a) assist the Council in exercising such powers of supervision over the application of international conventions and agreements dealing with narcotic drugs as may be assumed by or conferred on the Council;

(b) carry out such functions entrusted to the League of Nations Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs by the international conventions on narcotic drugs as the Council may find necessary to assume and continue;

(c) advise the Council on all matters pertaining to the control of narcotic drugs, and prepare such draft international conventions as may be necessary;

(d) consider what changes may be required in the existing machinery for the international control of narcotic drugs and submit proposals thereon to the Council;

(e) perform such other functions relating to narcotic drugs as the Council may direct.

3. The Commission may make recommendations to the Council concerning any subcommission which it considers should be established.

4. The Commission shall be composed of fifteen Members of the United Nations, which are important producing or manufacturing countries or

countries in which illicit traffic in narcotic drugs constitutes a serious social problem. The term of office of members is three years. They are eligible for reappointment.

5. The Commission is authorized by the Council to appoint in a consultative capacity, and without the right to vote, representatives of bodies created under the terms of international conventions on narcotic drugs.

6. The Council requests the following Governments to designate one representative each to constitute the Commission: Canada, China, Egypt, France, India, Iran, Mexico, Netherlands, Peru, Poland, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States of America, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Yugoslavia.

On the whole, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs is charged with functions similar to those exercised by the Opium Advisory Committee. It is composed of only 15 members, representing governments; the Opium Advisory Committee in 1939 had 24 members. The members of the present Commission have been chosen from countries which are members of the United Nations.

The members of the new Commission are representative of the producers, manufacturers, and consumers of narcotic drugs. India, Iran, Turkey, the Soviet Union, and Yugoslavia are large producers of opium. Peru and the Netherlands Indies produce coca leaves from which cocaine is extracted. Poland produces the opium poppy for direct conversion into morphine. The United Kingdom, the United States, the Soviet Union, France, and the Netherlands are important manufacturing countries. Canada, China, Egypt, and the United States are victims of the illicit traffic. Mexico is forced to combat considerable illicit production of opium.

Paragraph 5 of the terms of reference of the Commission, authorizing the appointment of consultants from among the members of the Permanent Central Opium Board and the Drug Supervisory Body, provides for a forward step. Because

¹ Report of the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations, p. 38.

² Journal of the Economic and Social Council, no. 12, pp. 129-130.

of their familiarity with and close study of the movement of drugs and world requirements, these members will be able to give valuable advice concerning many phases of the drug traffic.

In accordance with paragraph 5 of the resolution adopted by the Economic and Social Council on February 16, 1946, the Commission will take action regarding the issuance of invitations to the Permanent Central Opium Board and the Drug Supervisory Body to name representatives to sit on the Commission without the privilege of voting. It may be expected that the Commission will appoint subcommittees to deal with the following subjects: agenda, illicit traffic, limitation of the opium poppy, coca leaves and Indian hemp, and drug addiction.

The countries which are now responsible for the reestablishment of narcotic controls in Germany, Japan, and Korea will probably be requested to report on the situation in the areas under their jurisdiction.

In compliance with the resolution¹ adopted by the Economic and Social Council on September 26, 1946, the Commission will give consideration to and advise the Council on the procedure to be followed in making future appointments to the Permanent Central Opium Board.

The subjects which will engage the Commission for many days are the analysis of the world narcotics situation, the problem of the prohibition of the non-medical use of narcotic drugs, and the illicit traffic.

The world narcotics situation, because of the continued functioning throughout the war of the drug-control bodies, is not so bad as was anticipated in 1939. The huge accumulations of raw opium then in storage in the producing countries have been almost entirely exhausted by the war-time demands by the military forces. At the present time production of opium in Turkey, the Soviet Union, and Yugoslavia—the principal sources of opium for conversion into alkaloids for medicinal and scientific purposes—is hardly sufficient to meet such requirements. Production in India is almost entirely consumed in India and Burma. Afghanistan in 1945 and Iran in 1946 have prohibited the cultivation of opium poppies. China

¹ U.N. document E/168/Rev. 2, p. 4.

also prohibits the production of opium and is making strenuous efforts to enforce its laws. The planting of opium poppies has been prohibited in Japan and in the United States zone in Korea. Small quantities of opium continue to be produced in Siam and Burma. Considerable illicit cultivation of opium poppies is still carried on in Mexico. The planting of poppies for direct extraction of morphine from poppy straw continues in Central Europe, but such cultivation has undoubtedly declined since the termination of the war.

During the past two years important developments have taken place regarding the use of smoking opium. In 1945 and 1946 orders were issued closing the opium monopolies and suppressing the use of smoking opium in Hong Kong, Borneo, Singapore, and the Union of Malaya. The Colonial Government of Macao issued a proclamation closing all opium-smoking establishments and prohibiting all traffic in opium, effective June 26, 1946. On June 21, 1946 the Government of Iran published an order prohibiting the non-medical use of opium. The Federal Government of Indochina, on June 12, 1946, issued an ordinance prohibiting the use of opium and closing all opium shops and opium smoking dens.

The decreased production of opium and poppy straw and the prohibition of the use of smoking opium have had a far-reaching effect upon the illicit traffic. Large quantities of opium are no longer available for smuggling and use in the manufacture of smoking opium. Small quantities of opium, however, are constantly leaving the producing countries and are making their way into the illicit market in other countries. One of the most difficult tasks before the Commission on Narcotic Drugs is the study of the illicit traffic and the taking of measures to wipe it out completely.

It is expected that a majority of the members of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs will be represented by men experienced in the administration of narcotic laws. They will undoubtedly recommend practical measures that will make possible in the near future the eradication of the production of narcotic raw materials except for medical and scientific purposes. They will deserve and should receive the support of the people of the world.

THE UNITED NATIONS

Draft Trusteeship Agreement for the Japanese Mandated Islands

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT TRUMAN

[Released to the press by the White House November 6]

The United States is prepared to place under trusteeship, with the United States as the administering authority, the Japanese Mandated Islands and any Japanese islands for which it assumes responsibilities as a result of the second World War. Insofar as the Japanese Mandated Islands are concerned, this Government is transmitting for information to the other members of the Security Council (Australia, Brazil, China, Egypt, France,

Mexico, the Netherlands, Poland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom) and to New Zealand and the Philippines a draft of a strategic area trusteeship agreement which sets forth the terms upon which this Government is prepared to place those islands under trusteeship. At an early date we plan to submit this draft agreement formally to the Security Council for its approval.

TEXT OF DRAFT AGREEMENT¹

[Released to the press November 6]

Preamble

WHEREAS Article 75 of the Charter of the United Nations provides for the establishment of an international trusteeship system for the administration and supervision of such territories as may be placed thereunder by subsequent agreements; and

WHEREAS under Article 77 of the said Charter the trusteeship system may be applied to territories now held under mandate; and

WHEREAS on December 17, 1920 the Council of the League of Nations confirmed a mandate for the former German islands north of the equator to Japan, to be administered in accordance with Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations; and

WHEREAS Japan, as a result of the Second World War, has ceased to exercise any authority in these islands;

Now, THEREFORE, the Security Council of the United Nations, having satisfied itself that the relevant articles of the Charter having been complied with, hereby resolves to approve the following terms of trusteeship for the Pacific Islands formerly under mandate to Japan.

Article 1

The Territory of the Pacific Islands, consisting of the islands formerly held by Japan under mandate in accord-

¹This draft agreement for the Japanese Mandated Islands has been transmitted for information to the members of the Security Council of the United Nations and to New Zealand and the Philippines in accordance with President Truman's statement of Nov. 6, 1946.

THE UNITED NATIONS

ance with Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, is hereby designated as a strategic area and placed under the trusteeship system established in the Charter of the United Nations. The Territory of the Pacific Islands is hereinafter referred to as the trust territory.

Article 2

The United States of America is designated as the administering authority of the trust territory.

Article 3

The administering authority shall have full powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction over the territory subject to the provisions of this agreement as an integral part of the United States, and may apply to the trust territory, subject to any modifications which the administering authority may consider desirable, such of the laws of the United States as it may deem appropriate to local conditions and requirements.

Article 4

The administering authority, in discharging the obligations of trusteeship in the trust territory, shall act in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and the provisions of this agreement, and shall, as specified in Article 83 (2) of the Charter, apply the objectives of the international trusteeship system, as set forth in Article 76 of the Charter, to the people of the trust territory.

Article 5

In discharging its obligations under Article 76 (a) and Article 84, of the Charter, the administering authority shall ensure that the trust territory shall play its part, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, in the maintenance of international peace and security. To this end the administering authority shall be entitled:

(1) to establish naval, military and air bases and to erect fortifications in the trust territory;

(2) to station and employ armed forces in the territory; and

(3) to make use of volunteer forces, facilities and assistance from the trust territory in carrying out the obligations towards the Security Council undertaken in this regard by the administering authority, as well as for the local defense and the maintenance of law and order within the trust territory.

Article 6

In discharging its obligations under Article 76 (b) of the Charter, the administering authority shall:

(1) foster the development of such political institutions as are suited to the trust territory and shall promote the de-

velopment of the inhabitants of the trust territory toward self-government, and to this end shall give to the inhabitants of the trust territory a progressively increasing share in the administrative services in the territory; shall develop their participation in local government; shall give due recognition to the customs of the inhabitants in providing a system of law for the territory; and shall take other appropriate measures toward these ends;

(2) promote the economic advancement and self-sufficiency of the inhabitants and to this end shall regulate the use of natural resources; encourage the development of fisheries, agriculture, and industries; protect the inhabitants against the loss of their lands and resources; and improve the means of transportation and communication;

(3) promote the social advancement of the inhabitants, and to this end shall protect the rights and fundamental freedoms of all elements of the population without discrimination; protect the health of the inhabitants; control the traffic in arms and ammunition, opium and other dangerous drugs, and alcohol and other spiritous beverages; and institute such other regulations as may be necessary to protect the inhabitants against social abuses; and

(4) promote the educational advancement of the inhabitants, and to this end shall take steps toward the establishment of a general system of elementary education; facilitate the vocational and cultural advancement of the population; and shall encourage qualified students to pursue higher education, including training on the professional level.

Article 7

In discharging its obligations under Article 76 (c), of the Charter, the administering authority, subject only to the requirements of public order and security, shall guarantee to the inhabitants of the trust territory freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly; freedom of conscience, of worship, and of religious teaching; and freedom of migration and movement.

Article 8

1. In discharging its obligations under Article 76 (d) of the Charter, as defined by Article 83 (2) of the Charter, the administering authority, subject to the requirements of security, and the obligation to promote the advancement of the inhabitants, shall accord to nationals of each Member of the United Nations and to companies and associations organized in conformity with the laws of such Member, treatment in the trust territory no less favorable than that accorded therein to nationals, companies and associations of any other United Nation, except the administering authority.

THE UNITED NATIONS

2. The administering authority shall ensure equal treatment to the Members of the United Nations and their nationals in the administration of justice.

3. Nothing in this Article shall be so construed as to accord traffic rights to aircraft flying into and out of the trust territory. Such rights shall be subject to agreement between the administering authority and the state whose nationality such aircraft possesses.

4. The administering authority may negotiate and conclude commercial and other treaties and agreements with Members of the United Nations and other states, designed to attain for the inhabitants of the trust territory treatment by the Members of the United Nations and other states no less favorable than that granted by them to the nationals of other states. The Security Council may recommend, or invite other organs of the United Nations to consider and recommend, what rights the inhabitants of the trust territory should acquire in consideration of the rights obtained by Members of the United Nations in the trust territory.

Article 9

The administering authority shall be entitled to constitute the trust territory into a customs, fiscal, or administrative union or federation with other territories under United States jurisdiction and to establish common services between such territories and the trust territory where such measures are not inconsistent with the basic objectives of the International Trusteeship System and with the terms of this agreement.

Article 10

The administering authority, acting under the provisions of Article 3 of this agreement, may accept membership in any regional advisory commission, regional authority, or technical organization, or other voluntary association of states, may cooperate with specialized international bodies, public or private, and may engage in other forms of international cooperation.

United States Members on ECOSOC Commissions

[Released to the press by the White House November 6]

The President has appointed the following persons as the United States members of various commissions of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations:

Isador Lubin, Economic and Employment Commission.

Term—four years

Edward F. Bartelt, Fiscal Commission. Term—two

years

Article 11

1. The administering authority shall take the necessary steps to provide the status of citizenship of the trust territory for the inhabitants of the trust territory.

2. The administering authority shall afford diplomatic and consular protection to inhabitants of the trust territory when outside the territorial limits of the trust territory or of the territory of the administering authority.

Article 12

The administering authority shall enact such legislation as may be necessary to place the provisions of this agreement in effect in the trust territory.

Article 13

The provisions of Articles 87 and 88 of the Charter shall be applicable to the trust territory, provided that the administering authority may determine the extent of their applicability to any areas which may from time to time be specified by it as closed for security reasons.

Article 14

The administering authority undertakes to apply in the trust territory the provisions of any international conventions and recommendations which may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of the trust territory and which would be conducive to the achievement of the basic objectives of Article 6 of this agreement.

Article 15

The terms of the present agreement shall not be altered, amended or terminated without the consent of the administering authority.

Article 16

The present agreement shall come into force when approved by the Security Council of the United Nations and by the Government of the United States after due constitutional process.

Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, Human Rights Commission.
Term—four years

Philip M. Hauser, Population Commission. Term—two
years

Stuart A. Rice, Statistical Commission. Term—two
years

Dorothy Kenyon, Commission on Status of Women.
Term—three years

Arthur J. Altmeyer, Social Commission. Term—two
years

George P. Baker, Transport and Communications Commission. Term—four years

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Calendar of Meetings

In Session as of November 10, 1946

Far Eastern Commission.....	Washington.....	February 26.
United Nations:		
Security Council.....	Lake Success.....	March 25.
Military Staff Committee.....	Lake Success.....	March 25.
Commission on Atomic Energy.....	Lake Success.....	June 14.
UNRRA - Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees (IGCR):	Washington and	July 25.
Joint Planning Committee	Lake Success.	
General Assembly.....	Flushing Meadows...	October 23.
Telecommunications Advisory Committee.....	Lake Success.....	November 10.
German External Property Negotiations with Portugal (Safehaven)...	Lisbon.....	September 3.
PICAO:		
Interim Council.....	Montreal.....	September 4.
Regional		
Air Traffic Control Committee, European-Mediterranean Region	Paris.....	October 28-November 5.
Divisional		
Meteorological Division.....	Montreal.....	October 29.
International Committee on Weights and Measures.....	Paris.....	October 22-29.
Permanent Committee of the International Health Office.....	Paris.....	October 23-31.
FAO: Preparatory Commission To Study World Food Board Proposals	Washington.....	October 28.
World Health Organization (WHO): Interim Commission.....	Geneva.....	November 4.
Council of Foreign Ministers.....	New York.....	November 4.
IARA: Meetings on Conflicting Custodial Claims.....	Brussels.....	November 6.
International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts (CITEJA)	Cairo.....	November 6-19.
Scheduled for November 1946-January 1947		
International Wool Talks.....	London.....	November 11-16.
U. S. - U. K. Meetings on Bizonal Arrangements for Germany.....	Washington.....	November 12
UNESCO:		
Preparatory Commission.....	Paris.....	November 14-15.
General Conference.....	Paris.....	November 19.
"Month" Exhibition.....	Paris.....	November.
ILO:		
Industrial Committee on Textiles.....	Brussels.....	November 14-22.
Industrial Committee on Building, Civil Engineering and Public Works	Brussels.....	November 25-December 3.

Calendar prepared in the Division of International Conferences, Department of State.

Calendar of Meetings—Continued

Second Inter-American Congress of Radiology	Habana	November 17-22.
PICAO:		
Divisional		
Communications Division	Montreal	November 19.
Search and Rescue Division	Montreal	November 26.
Rules of the Air and Air Traffic Control Practices Division	Montreal	December 3.
Personnel Licensing Division	Montreal	January 7.
Aeronautical Maps and Charts Division	Montreal	January 14.
International Whaling Conference	Washington	November 20.
Rubber Study Group Meeting	The Hague	November 25.
United Nations:		
Economic and Social Council		
Commission on Narcotic Drugs	Lake Success	November 27.
Statistical Commission	Lake Success	January (tentative).
Inter-American Commission of Women: Fifth Annual Assembly	Washington	December 2-12.
Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees (IGCR): Sixth Plenary Session	London	December 16.
Meeting of Medical and Statistical Commissions of Inter-American Committee on Social Security	Washington	January 6-11.
Twelfth Pan American Sanitary Conference	Caracas	January 12-24.
Second Pan American Conference on Sanitary Education	Caracas	January 12-24.

Activities and Developments »

MEETING OF INTERIM COMMISSION OF WHO

[Released to the press November 5]

Acting Secretary of State Acheson announced on November 5 that Dr. Thomas Parran, Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, and United States Representative on the Interim Commission of the World Health Organization, had left to attend the Second Session of the Interim Commission, convening this week at Geneva, Switzerland. Dr. Parran is accompanied by the alternate United States representative on the Interim Commission, Dr. H. Van Zile Hyde, Division of International Labor, Social and Health Affairs, Department of State; Dr. James A. Doull, chief, Office of International Health Relations, United States Public Health Service; and Dr. Howard B. Calderwood, public health consultant, Office of International Health Relations, United States Public Health Service.

ACTIVITIES AND DEVELOPMENTS

Among the items on the agenda of this Second Session, which began on November 4, will be a consideration of relationships between the World Health Organization and the United Nations, the transfer to the World Health Organization of the health functions of other international agencies, the League of Nations, UNRRA, and the Office International d'Hygiène Publique; and the appointment of technical committees to be concerned with epidemiology and quarantine, health in devastated areas, and medical nomenclature.

U. S. DELEGATION TO CITEJA

Acting Secretary of State Acheson announced on November 5 that the following members of the United States Section of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts (CITEJA) had left for Cairo, Egypt, to attend the fifteenth plenary meeting of the Committee which began on November 6: John C. Cooper, the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N. J.; Richard E. Elwell, general counsel, Civil Aeronautics Administration; Arnold W. Knauth, specialist in maritime and aviation law, Department of Justice; and Emory T. Nunneley, general counsel, Civil Aeronautics Administration. This group, which will be headed by Mr. Nunneley, is accompanied by two members of the Advisory Committee to the United States Section: Edward C. Sweeney, editor, *Journal of Air Law and Commerce*, Northwestern University, Chicago, Ill.; and Stuart G. Tipton, general counsel, Air Transport Association of America.

U. S. DELEGATION TO INTERNATIONAL WOOL TALKS

[Released to the press November 4]

The Secretary of State announced on November 4 that the President had approved the composition of the United States Delegation to the International Wool Talks, scheduled to begin in London, England, November 11, 1946.¹

Representatives of the governments principally interested in wool, either as producers or consumers, will meet for a joint review and discussion of the world situation as regards clothing wools.

¹ For an article on American Wool Import Policy, see *BULLETIN* of Nov. 3, 1946, p. 783.

They will also consider the possibilities of future wool developments.

The members of the Delegation are:

Chairman:

Donald Kennedy, chief, International Resources Division, Department of State

Advisers:

Floyd Davis, acting head, Division of Livestock and Wool, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, Department of Agriculture

Clarence Nichols, assistant chief, International Resources Division, Department of State

Paul Nyhus, agricultural attaché, American Embassy, London

Preston Richards, assistant director, Livestock Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture

Robert Schwenger, special assistant to the director, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, Department of Agriculture

AMERICAN ADVISERS TO THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF UNESCO

William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, announced on November 8 that the following persons will serve as advisers to the U. S. delegation to the first session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization which convenes in Paris on November 19:

A. J. Brumbaugh, member, Executive Committee, Commission on International Educational Reconstruction, and vice president, American Council on Education

Nelson H. Cruikshank, director, Social Insurance Activities, American Federation of Labor

Kermitt Eby, director of education and research, Congress of Industrial Organization

Monsignor Frederick G. Hochwalt, director, Department of Education, National Catholic Welfare Conference

Kenneth Holland, assistant director, Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs, Department of State

Walter Kotschnig, associate chief, Division of International Organization Affairs, Department of State

James Marshall, member, Board of Education, New York

Richard McKeon, Dean of Humanities, University of Chicago

Carl H. Milam, executive secretary, American Library Association

W. Albert Noyes, president, American Chemical Society

Mrs. Henry Potter Russell, chairman, Women's Board, San Francisco Museum of Art, and president, San Francisco Community Chest

Charles A. Thomson, adviser, Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs, Department of State

Mrs. Pearl A. Wanamaker, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Washington, and president of the National Education Association

Mrs. Louise Wright, executive secretary, Chicago Council on Foreign Relations

Mr. Benton stated: "The first Session of the General Conference of UNESCO has immense potential significance. It will lay down the program of the new Organization, select its first director general, and reach agreements on budgetary matters. For these reasons, great pains have been taken to assure that the United States will be well represented at Paris in many branches of UNESCO's activities."

The Preparatory Commission of UNESCO will hold its final meeting in Paris on November 14 and 15. The United States will be represented by Dr. Esther Brunauer, assisted by her alternates, Dr. Harvard Arnason and Dr. Richard A. Johnson.¹

TWENTY GOVERNMENTS INVITED TO INTERNATIONAL WHALING CONFERENCE

[Released to the press November 7]

The Department of State announced on November 7 that invitations had been issued to 20 governments to participate in an international whaling conference to be held in Washington, D.C., beginning November 20, 1946. The following Governments have been invited: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Denmark, France, Ireland, Iceland, Mexico, the Netherlands, Newfoundland, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Sweden, the Union of South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The objective of the conference is to amend and codify existing international regulations governing the conduct of whaling, with a view to conserving and developing the existing stocks of whales.

It is also anticipated that the conference will consider means for facilitating the formulation and adoption of future amendments to the regulations from time to time, as conditions may require, without the necessity of calling international conferences as has been the practice in the past.

The United States has participated in previous international conferences concerned with the regulation of whaling, commencing with the conference convoked by the League of Nations in 1931.

The body of regulations which have been drawn up at various international conferences include restrictions such as limitations on the length of the whaling season, minimum legal length of whales taken, closed waters, catch limitations, and prohibition on the taking of certain species.

THIRD MEETING OF THE RUBBER STUDY GROUP²

The Department of State announced on November 7 that the United States had accepted an invitation from the Government of the Netherlands to participate in the third meeting of the Rubber Study Group.

This meeting is scheduled to take place at The Hague on November 25, 1946 with the Netherlands Government as host. Donald D. Kennedy, Chief of the International Resources Division, Department of State, will be the United States delegate, with William T. Phillips, Special Assistant on Commodity Policy, International Resources Division, Department of State, as alternate delegate. In addition, Mr. Kennedy will be accompanied by seven advisers representing other United States Government agencies and the United States rubber industry and by an attaché of the American Embassy at London.

Advisers will be H. C. Bugbee, attaché, United States Embassy, London; William L. Batt, chairman, Inter-Agency Policy Committee on Rubber; Alan L. Grant, president, Rubber Development Corporation; George M. Tisdale, chairman, Combined Rubber Committee; Everett G. Holt, rubber adviser, Department of Commerce; P. W. Litchfield, chairman, Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company; John L. Collyer, president, B. F. Goodrich Company; and A. L. Viles, president, Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc.

¹ See BULLETIN of Oct. 27, 1946, p. 779, and of Nov. 10, 1946, p. 842.

² Prepared by the Division of International Resources in collaboration with the Division of International Conferences.

ACTIVITIES AND DEVELOPMENTS

The Rubber Study Group is the outgrowth of the exploratory rubber talks held by representatives of the Netherlands, United Kingdom, and the United States in London during early August 1944.¹ At that meeting the representatives explored the possible post-war rubber supply in relation to post-war demand. The participants were aware that adequate statistical information was not readily available for a thorough discussion. Consequently, the three governments agreed to the formation of an informal Rubber Study Group to meet periodically for the purpose of presenting and making a detailed analysis and study of all the statistical data available to each member country with respect to the common problems arising from the production, manufacture, or use of natural, synthetic, and reclaimed rubber.

The Group is not authorized to formulate and transmit recommendations to the participating governments. However, the respective governments have at their disposal all the available information of the proceedings of the Rubber Study Group.

The first meeting of the Rubber Study Group was held in Washington in January 1945, attended by the representatives of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Each of the members presented a study of rubber problems of mutual interest.

The second meeting was held during November 1945 in London, with the United Kingdom as host Government. At that meeting France was invited to participate as a member, and its representative joined the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States in attempting to re-appraise and reconsider the rubber situation in light of the cessation of hostilities and the liberation of the Far Eastern rubber-producing areas.

At the coming third meeting of the Rubber Study Group further studies of common rubber problems will be made on the basis of the latest statistical information available. Representatives plan to be present from France, the Nether-

lands, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The meeting is expected to adjourn by November 30, 1946.

TOURIST CONFERENCE REVIVES INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN TRAVEL¹

Official delegates from 41 governments met at London, October 1-7, 1946 for the purpose of reviving and expanding international cooperation in promoting travel between nations. The Government of the United States was represented at the International Tourist Organizations Conference by George Tait, Consul General and Counselor of the Embassy at London, England, and Herbert A. Wilkinson of the Department of Commerce.

Among the more important results of the Conference were the following:

1. Contacts between the governments of the participating countries for the interchange of information in the field of travel were developed; and the attention of the public, of the several governments, and of the United Nations was directed to the necessity of eliminating the myriad impediments to a free flow of travelers between countries.

2. Resolutions pointing out the importance of travel to expanding international trade, the creation of foreign exchange, and the development of mutual understanding of cultural and intellectual activities were passed unanimously.

3. Resolutions urging the immediate simplification of frontier formalities, abolishment of currency controls, and the elimination of passport and visa impediments were adopted.

4. Formation of an exploratory committee, of which the United States is a member, to recommend to the next meeting the form and purpose of an expanded international travel organization and a method of cooperation with the United Nations in dealing with problems of encouraging freedom of travel.

5. Adoption of a definition of "tourist" which includes commercial travelers, students, trainees, businessmen, and public officials, in addition to visitors traveling for personal, recreational, health, or professional reasons. In general, this definition might be said to include anyone who leaves the country of his residence for a period of more than 24 hours with the intention of returning.

¹ See BULLETIN of June 2, 1946, p. 932, for an article by Mr. Phillips on "Rubber and World Economy".

² Prepared by the Division of International Conferences of the Department of State in collaboration with the Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce.

PAUL T. DAVID APPOINTED TO PICAQ COMMITTEE

[Released to the press by the White House November 6]

The President has designated Paul T. David as United States representative on the Air Transport Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization. Mr. David will serve under the general direction of Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, United States representative on the Interim Council of PICAQ.

Adoption of the definition by the participating governments would eliminate the discrimination against commercial travelers that currently exists in many countries in the form of the imposition of many special rules and irritating formalities.

6. Formation of a committee, of which the United States is a member, to study and report to the next travel conference on methods of standardizing international tourist statistics and facilitating the free exchange of such information.

Caribbean Regional Air Navigational Meeting of PICAQ

An Article

The Caribbean Regional Air Navigation Meeting of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization (PICAQ), which met at Washington from August 26 through September 13, 1946, was the third in a series of regional meetings called under the auspices of PICAQ to consider the facilities and supplemental standards, practices, and procedures necessary for the safe and expeditious operation of international air-transport services in ten regions throughout the world. These PICAQ regional meetings will go far to insure common operating standards and practices for international air carriers. In addition, the meetings are highly useful as educational gatherings where information pertaining to installations as well as to techniques of air navigation and ground aids to air transport can be exchanged to the mutual benefit of all attending nations.

In air-navigation matters, PICAQ has been engaged in developing recommended standards, practices, and procedures for the following technical fields: air-traffic control, meteorology, air-dromes and ground aids, search and rescue, communications, airworthiness requirements, operating procedures, accident investigation, personnel licensing, and aeronautical maps and charts.

As regards the first five of these fields, it early became apparent that the standards and procedures developed would have to be modified and perhaps supplemented before they could be applied to the varying geographical and aeronautical conditions throughout the world. For this reason

the PICAQ Interim Council divided the world into ten regions and instituted a program of regional meetings to discuss facilities supporting five fields and to modify or supplement the standards and procedures pertaining to them.

The first regional PICAQ air-navigation meeting was held in Dublin, Ireland, in March of this year to consider facilities and standards of operation along heavily traveled routes in the North Atlantic region. The Dublin conference established a pattern for the nine other regional meetings planned by PICAQ. The Dublin pattern has been modified and improved upon only slightly during the following meetings. The Dublin conference was followed in late April and early May by a Paris meeting which considered technical problems facing international civil aviation in the combined European-Mediterranean region. And the recent Caribbean meeting was followed in October by the Cairo air-navigation meeting which covered the Middle East region. With six additional regional meetings scheduled to meet under the auspices of PICAQ during the coming year, it appears that PICAQ has planned wisely for regional implementation of its program designed to bring about uniformity of operating practices and procedures of international civil air carriers as well as to insure that air navigation, weather, communications, and search and rescue facilities in each region are sufficient for their safe operation.

At each of the regional air-navigation meetings

ACTIVITIES AND DEVELOPMENTS

a general review is made of existing facilities within the particular region for air-traffic control, aviation communications, aviation meteorology, search and rescue, and airdromes, air routes, and ground aids. Besides reviewing existing facilities in each of these fields for their adequacy and for informational purposes, recommendations are made as to additional facilities needed, and proposals are developed with respect to supplemental technical standards, practices, and procedures which conform to the peculiarities of the region under consideration. The recommendations are then reviewed by the PICAQ Air Navigation Committee at Montreal, Canada, prior to their presentation to the PICAQ Interim Council for approval. Once approved by the Council, each member government of PICAQ is obligated to use its best efforts to carry out the recommendations.

With such a diversity of technical matters being discussed and with the obvious interest of American flag airlines in the subject matter of the meetings, the developing of a well-rounded United States position has been a problem. Pre-delegation activities of the United States delegations have been handled through the medium of interdepartmental working committees established within the framework of the Air Coordinating Committee. Representatives of American flag international airlines as well as the Air Transport Association and Aeronautical Radio, Inc., have actively assisted in an advisory capacity. Industry participation in the working committees and in the delegations themselves has been thorough and extremely beneficial to both government and industry. It is safe to say that without such industry advice and assistance the United States could not possibly have taken such an active and leading role in the work of the regional meetings. The interdepartmental character of the United States delegation is made obvious by listing the Government agencies represented: Departments of State, War, and Navy; the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Weather Bureau from the Department of Commerce; the Civil Aeronautics

Board; the Coast Guard; the Federal Communications Commission; and the Maritime Commission. All have taken an active part not only in formulating pre-meeting United States proposals but also in the work of the United States delegations during the meetings themselves.

At each regional air-navigation meeting the governments of countries within the particular region or whose airlines operate to or in the region under consideration are issued invitations for full participation. Any other governments which are members of PICAQ may send observers to the meetings, and, in addition, representatives of international government and private organizations interested in any of the five fields listed above are issued invitations for attendance as observers. Thus, for the Caribbean regional meeting the following Governments and organizations were present: Argentina, Australia,¹ Brazil, Canada, Chile, China,¹ Colombia, Costa Rica,² Cuba,² Czechoslovakia,¹ Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Haiti, Honduras, Iraq,¹ Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Panama,² Peru, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, International Air Transport Association, International Meteorological Organization, Inter-American Radio Office, International Telecommunications Union, and, of course, the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization.

At the opening session of the Caribbean meeting on August 26, 1946 Charles I. Stanton, chairman of the United States delegation, was elected president of the meeting and chairman of the General Committee. This General Committee was composed of the heads of delegations of the participating governments, and its task was to review, modify, and finally adopt proposals made by each of the five committees formed to consider problems arising in the technical fields listed above. In addition, the General Committee appointed a Regional Manual Subcommittee and an Operations Subcommittee.

The Regional Manual Subcommittee accepted in general a United States proposal which, in effect, recommends two regional publications:

(a) the *Caribbean Supplementary Procedures for*

¹ Observing Governments.

² Non-member states of PICAQ.

Air Navigation Services, to contain those regional procedures which are required to supplement PICAO procedures for air-navigation services. This publication is designed primarily for ground personnel. (b) the *Caribbean Airmen's Guide*, to contain pertinent information concerning air-navigation procedures and facilities within the region. This publication is designed primarily for the benefit of airmen. The manual reports which had been developed earlier at the Dublin and Paris meetings were consolidated and were used generally as a basis for the proposed Caribbean publications as regards such matters as style, format, and content. The manual document adopted by the Caribbean meeting is believed to be an example of the type of airmen's guide required in any region throughout the world.

In organizing communication centers for the handling of notices to airmen (NOTAM), the Manual Subcommittee was confronted with the fact that there are many small states within the Caribbean region, the majority of which have very few aeronautical facilities within the territories. For this reason a proposal was adopted recommending the establishment of only six regional NOTAM offices instead of having one in each country, a proposal which should prove a worthwhile saving to all states concerned. The plan is to have the regional NOTAM offices report to a central office within the Caribbean region which in turn will coordinate its information with central NOTAM offices in other regions.

The Operations Subcommittee had several controversial items on its agenda. One of particular interest was the question as to whether the metric or the English system of measurement should be used. The General Committee adopted a recommendation that the unit of measure in horizontal distance be the nautical mile. This particular item of controversy was well handled, and the documents submitted to the General Committee for approval reflected the fact that the nations working together had an understanding of each other's problems and were willing to compromise in order to arrive at a workable solution.

Another problem faced by the Operations Sub-

committee was that of devising standard instrument landing-approach procedures for airdromes in the region. The United States proposed a formula, accepted by the meeting, which can be applied to any airdrome with only minor changes to be made where physical obstructions require a departure from normal practices.

The Search and Rescue Committee of the region reviewed existing facilities and listed supplementary facilities which the Committee felt were needed for adequate search and rescue operations within the region. In addition, this Committee conducted a study of operating procedures and instructions for the coordination of search and rescue matters. The Committee decided that the Caribbean region could be served adequately by the same procedures which had been developed at the previous Dublin and Paris meetings, with only minor additions, such as special procedures to provide for contingencies arising as a result of hurricanes.

Discussion in the Air Traffic Control Committee revolved around a United Kingdom proposal to cover the entire Caribbean area with flight safety regions and to provide only a limited amount of traffic control. The United States suggested that air-traffic control be limited to those places where air traffic converged, with flight safety regions limited to those areas necessary at this time. A compromise was finally developed and adopted by the General Committee whereby clearly defined air-traffic control areas were established covering a radius of approximately 150 miles from specified control points. Flight safety region boundaries were eliminated entirely, with a proviso that each control point will supply flight information service for safety purposes beyond its control area to the extent of its ability. Thus, in effect, flight safety regions will be fluid rather than defined.

Other major accomplishments of the Air Traffic Control Committee included unanimous agreement on a plan specifying the basic meteorological requirements for adequate air-traffic control and a plan specifying the basic communications requirements to fulfil this type of activity. These proposals are considered as worthwhile standards for world-wide application.

ACTIVITIES AND DEVELOPMENTS

The Communications Committee of the Caribbean meeting was confronted with a point of major interest peculiar to this region. Unlike other regions of the world, many of the facilities used for communications in the Caribbean are owned by private concerns which provide services only to those aeronautical companies responsible for the establishment of such facilities. Since an increase in service rendered by these facilities would entail considerable additional expense, the private companies could not commit themselves to making these facilities available to all prospective users. The countries in whose territories the facilities are located do not appear to be financially or technically capable of providing general service at the present time. Since one objective of PICAO is to make facilities available to all users on a non-discriminatory basis, this subject was discussed at considerable length. The Communications Committee finally decided that the situation would gradually be worked out as the countries involved trained their own technicians and eventually took over these services.

On the recommendation of the United Kingdom and France, the General Committee adopted the Communications Committee proposal that the basic communications procedures developed at the Dublin and Paris meetings be accepted at all future regional meetings. It was felt that in future meetings only the procedures peculiar to the particular region under discussion needed to be developed for publication in the Regional Supplement.

The Meteorological Committee was confronted with a problem similar to that which faced the Communications Committee, since many meteorological facilities in the Caribbean are privately operated. The weather reports emanating from such facilities are available only to the owners of those facilities. The Meteorological Committee recommended that PICAO consider all weather observations and reports made by qualified observers to be international in character and to be made available to government meteorological services on a non-discriminatory basis.

The Meteorological Committee took exception

to the proposal of the Operations Subcommittee to express visibility in nautical miles and recommended to PICAO that the statute mile be used. This recommendation was in line with the plans adopted by the International Meteorological Organization to use the statute mile at all times.

In as much as most of the airdromes within the region are already international in character, the Committee on Airdromes and Ground Aids had little difficulty in carrying out its work. This Committee found that substitutes for the international landing fields now being used in the region were either impractical or impossible.

The governments participating in the Washington meeting as well as PICAO itself have every reason to feel that the Washington meeting was most productive. For one thing, representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, Netherlands, France, and most of the international organizations have been present at all of the regional air-navigation meetings held so far and have gained valuable experience from previous meetings. The problems before the regional meetings are understood much more completely than was the case before the PICAO regional program was started. Also, the delegates representing the various governments, having worked together before at regional meetings and at Montreal, realized that compromises have to be made in order to obtain practical and workable recommendations which can be applied to the peculiarities of each region under consideration.

The basic problems confronting PICAO regional meetings are similar in nature the world over. A stable foundation for the work of such meetings has been laid and is now generally accepted. Future regional meetings, therefore, should not have to devote time to basic considerations in the technical fields of air-traffic control, search and rescue, communications, meteorology, and airdromes and ground aids. At future meetings, once the task of reviewing existing facilities is accomplished, only supplementary procedures and practices peculiar to the region under consideration will have to be added to the basic documents developed at the Dublin, Paris, and Washington PICAO air-navigation meetings.

PICAO Conference on North Atlantic Ocean Weather Observation Stations

Article by J. Paul Barringer

The conception of the establishment of ocean weather stations was first advanced in the scientific world approximately 25 years ago by the International Meteorological Organization. However, no action was taken other than the establishment, in about 1937, by France, of a vessel equipped for scientific and meteorological exploration in the North Atlantic. During the war, the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom established a number of such stations for the collection of meteorological data and as aids to air navigation across the North Atlantic. At one time there were as many as 21 ocean weather stations in operation, financed by the individual governments without international agreement. Procedures for standardization and coordination of observations and of exchange of data were established between the military authorities of allied nations. Demobilization and shortage of manpower following the war caused most of the stations to be disbanded, with the exception of four currently being operated by the United States. The requirement for such stations had become greatly emphasized by the increased air traffic between North America and Europe. The need for the establishment, operation, and coordination of these stations was first officially recognized at the PICAO North Atlantic Route Service Conference, held in Dublin on March 4, 1946. The Interim Council of PICAO, in June 1946, approved the recommendations of that conference to the effect that PICAO take action to establish 13 stations in the North Atlantic.

The Interim Council of PICAO received the acceptance of the Government of the United Kingdom to act as host Government to the conference; it convened the Conference of North Atlantic Stations for September 17, 1946 in the Auditorium of the Royal Geographic Society, No. 1 Kensing-

ton Gore, London S. W. 7. The Governments invited by cable on August 26 and by letter of invitation on August 27 were: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom, and United States.

A list of the delegates, advisers, and observers follows:

DELEGATIONS

Belgium

Lt. Col. J. Verhaegen
S/L O. Godart
M. G. Timmermanns

Canada

A. C. McKim
P. D. McTaggart Cowan

Denmark

G. E. Teisen
M. Crone
Commander N. Brammer (adviser)

France

R. Massigli (Ambassador in London)
M. Haguénau
J. E. Le Roy
M. Gauthier-Villars
Capt. A. Gras

Holland

Dr. W. Bleeker
Capt. A. S. de Bats
M. P. de Winter
Dr. A. Treep

Iceland

M. Elridikur Benediktz

Ireland

D. Herlihy
Dr. M. Doporto
P. T. McCarthy

United Kingdom

Sir Nelson Johnson
E. G. Bilham
J. Durward
Commander C. Frankcom

ACTIVITIES AND DEVELOPMENTS

R. C. Chilver
W/C L. E. Botting
W. L. Shaw
S. P. Peters (alternate to J. Durward)
O. G. Caines (alternate to Mr. Chilver)

Experts

S/L T. A. Stewart
S/L C. S. Hawley
S/L D. Wilson
J. E. S. Fawcett

Observers

Capt. J. Fleming
Capt. H. Quick
N. Bradbury

United States

J. P. Barringer
D. M. Little (alternate)
Maj. Gen. L. S. Kuter (alternate)

Advisers

P. T. David
Commander G. V. Graves, USCG
N. R. Hagen
Capt. R. F. Hickey, USN
Maj. P. H. Huber
C. H. Lample
Capt. H. C. Moore, USCG
C. L. Stanton

Norway

Dr. S. Petterssen
B. Grinde
G. O. Moe
C. Lous
L. Christensen (technical adviser)

Portugal

Commander A. F. Roriz

Spain

Col. Don C. Sartorius
Lt. Col. Don C. Gorozarri

Sweden

Dr. H. Berglund
Dr. A. K. Angstrom

International Meteorological Organization

E. Gold

PICAO

Dr. E. Warner
I. H. McClure
E. M. Weld
G/C. F. Entwistle
T. S. Banes
Col. N. D. Vaughn
Dr. J. A. Fruin
Dr. J. Dubsky
Miss V. Vaughn

International Air Transport Association

E. C. Terlske
J. MacDougall
W. Brook Williams

Acting upon the invitation of the Interim Council of PICAO and upon PICAO Memorandum, Doc. 1955, dated July 25, 1946, which thoroughly reviewed and outlined the problem, the Air Coordinating Committee instructed its Subcommittee on PICAO Matters to select the membership of an American delegation to the conference and to formulate instructions for this delegation. The specific instructions to the delegation, as to the position of the United States on matters to be brought before the conference, were prepared by the PICAO Subcommittee of the Air Coordinating Committee in the form of annotations to the proposed agenda submitted by PICAO Doc. 1955 and were fully reflected in the final agreement.

The conference was opened on September 17 by Dr. Edward Warner, president of the Interim Council of PICAO, acting as chairman. An initial address of welcome to the delegates on behalf of His Majesty's Government was delivered by the Rt. Hon. Geoffrey de Freitas, M.P., Under Secretary of State for Air.

The conference proceeded directly with the business of organization, adoption of rules of procedure, agenda, and other initial matters. Upon motion of the American delegate, Sir Nelson Johnson of the United Kingdom was elected chairman of the conference. Mr. Anson McKim, the Canadian delegate, was elected vice chairman. Dr. Dubsky of the PICAO Secretariat was appointed secretary general of the conference. The following Commissions were appointed which, in turn, elected chairmen and appointed secretaries:

Financial Commission:

Chairman	Anson McKim, Canada
Secretary	E. M. Weld, PICAO
U.S. representative	J. P. Barringer
U.S. adviser	P. T. David

Technical Commission:

Chairman	Dr. S. Petterssen, Norway
Secretary	c/o F. Entwistle, PICAO
U.S. representative	D. M. Little
U.S. advisers	Capt. H. C. Moore Commander G. V. Graves Maj. P. M. Huber N. R. Hagen

ACTIVITIES AND DEVELOPMENTS

Drafting Commission:

Chairman J. E. S. Fawcett, U.K.
 Secretary Dr. J. A. Fruin, PICA
 U.S. representatives P. T. David
 N. R. Hagen

The conference was comparatively small and it was therefore possible to dispense with many of the usual committees, such as nominations and steering. Several *ad hoc* subcommittees of the Technical Commission were created for reports on specific agenda items as recorded in the report of that Commission. All remarks made at all plenary sessions and Commission proceedings and all documentation were recorded in English and French, the official languages of the conference.

The Financial Commission met in four sessions to discuss and recommend a solution of the main problem of the conference—the distribution of the economic burden of the project. Other agenda items bearing upon this problem were not specifically discussed or reported upon, but they were taken into consideration in general discussions. In the deliberations there was almost immediate agreement that an equitable distribution of the burden should be based upon the general principle of contributions in services and in kind, which would minimize initial and recurring transfer of funds, and also upon the universal desire to operate weather-station vessels in preference to contributions in cash. Discussions in the Commission also disclosed that the application of any exact mathematical formula was impractical since it would involve variable cost figures, indeterminate, direct and collateral contributions and benefits, and in the end substantial transfer of funds.

The general formula agreed upon as a guide placed primary emphasis on frequencies of trans-Atlantic crossings, both military and civil. Current frequencies were not considered desirable for use as the sole criteria; therefore, all representatives submitted estimates of average weekly round trips, both military and civil, proposed for the peak months, June and July 1947, and for the year ending July 1948. Such estimates were considered to be the roughest speculation for use as a starting point only.

United States percentages appeared as follows:

Current	70 percent
June and July 1947	65 "
Year ending July 1948	75 "

After examination of all factors the American delegation agreed to recommend that the United States Government assume responsibility for providing and operating seven stations and an eighth jointly with Canada, only if European states would agree to operate the remaining five. The United States would thus assume 58 percent of the total project. This proposal was advanced only after it became clear that an offer of six stations and a seventh jointly with Canada would produce only three to four operated by the European states. Technical advisers were unanimous in the position that a program of 13 stations provided minimum coverage to effect the desired weather observation.

The Commission finally agreed to recommend to the conference that states provide and operate stations as follows:

State	Number of stations
U.S.	7
U.K.	2
France	1
U.S. and Canada, 50 percent each	1
Netherlands and Belgium, 50 percent each	1
Sweden, U.K., and Norway, 43 percent, 35 percent, 22 percent, respectively, Norway to operate	1
Total	13

The Technical Commission considered all technical agenda items, i.e., location of stations, types of and extent of services to be given, including meteorological, air-sea rescue, air navigational, and incidental services. Because of the variety of technical problems requiring study and recommendation, several subcommissions were appointed. All final recommendations were incorporated in the annexes to the agreement.

The question of what agency should coordinate the entire establishment and operation of the project was the only important point which could not be resolved in the deliberations of the Commission. Discussion therefore reverted to plenary session, in which a determined effort on the part of

ACTIVITIES AND DEVELOPMENTS

one delegation to establish the International Meteorological Organization as the sole agency for such coordination was met by unanimous disapproval of all other delegates.

The drafting of the final act and agreement in Commission and their consideration by the conference in plenary session was marked by a universal desire to keep the documents as brief and as non-technical as possible. It was generally agreed that all individual arrangements among two or more states covering the joint operation of stations and all agreements of a technical nature should take the form of annexes in order that minor future changes could be made without revision of the weather-station agreement.

The final act reviewed the work of the conference in briefest terms, listed the participating delegations and conference officials, stated that the agreement had been established with annexes as described, listed governments intending to participate in the financing and operation of the stations, and finally bound the delegates of the signatory governments to use their best endeavors to secure early acceptance of the agreement by their respective governments.

The international agreement on North Atlantic weather observation stations consists of a preamble, eight articles, a signatory paragraph, and four annexes. It provides in general that the Governments of Belgium, Canada, France, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom, and United States, being members of PICAQ, have agreed.

(1) that 13 ocean weather stations be operated at locations in the North Atlantic specified in Annex I.

(2) that meteorological, search and rescue, air navigational, supplementary air traffic control and other incidental services be performed as detailed in Annex I.

(3) that PICAQ shall coordinate the project and may change annexes with the consent of governments affected.

(4) that signatory governments shall finance and operate the stations.

(5) that PICAQ shall convene a conference not

later than April 1, 1949, for consideration of revision and renewal of the agreement.

(6) that the agreement come into effect upon acceptance by all the signatory governments, all signatures being *ad referendum*.

The conference as a whole was marked with a universal spirit of cooperation and an enthusiasm on the part of all delegates and advisers which enabled the conference to complete its work and to approve the final act and agreement in seven days only. The conference benefited immeasurably from the constant advice and guidance of the president of the Interim Council of PICAQ, Dr. Edward Warner. The many exploratory discussions which were held informally between various delegations served as an important adjunct to the work in conference and resulted in the final agreement.

All considerations and discussions held in constant regard the fact that the final agreement might establish a precedent for a number of similar international agreements among groups of governments throughout the world and that this agreement might conceivably in time become a part of a much larger multilateral agreement covering the establishment of international aids to air navigation. For this reason the article providing for the calling of a conference of participating governments to reexamine and renew the agreement made no provision for any specific criteria upon which future participation should be evaluated. It is believed that this conference and the resulting final act and agreement will prove to be a major step forward in the establishment of aids to air navigation on the basis of international cooperation and agreement.

All interested agencies of the Executive Branch of the Government have individually and through the Air Coordinating Committee supported the agreement. They have agreed to support the Treasury Department on behalf of the United States Coast Guard and the Department of Commerce on behalf of the Weather Bureau in their efforts to obtain for those agencies the increased appropriations necessary to carry out the proposed obligation of the United States Government under the agreement.

International Action on Agricultural and Nutrition Problems

FAO COPENHAGEN CONFERENCE AND FAO PREPARATORY COMMISSION

Article by Duncan Wall

Ways and means of achieving healthful diets for the world's people and stable prices for agricultural producers, objectives accepted by the Copenhagen Conference of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization held from September 2 to 13, 1946, are being currently discussed in Washington by representatives of 16 member countries of a preparatory commission created at Copenhagen in September.¹

The Copenhagen Conference left wholly to the Preparatory Commission the question of machinery to achieve these objectives. The United States took no position on how the goals were to be reached.

"These aims are not separate," said Sir John Boyd Orr, Director General of FAO, in opening the Preparatory Commission's meeting. "They are two aspects of a single aim—a healthy, vigorous, world-wide economic expansion."

Norris E. Dodd, Under Secretary of Agriculture and United States member of the Commission, said in the opening plenary sessions of the Commission that the United States firmly supports these objectives.

Mr. Dodd pointed out that the United States has recently put forward proposals for an International Trade Organization, now under study by another preparatory commission in London. These proposals, he said, also are aimed at expansion of employment, production, trade, and consumption; there is also a chapter on intergovernmental commodity arrangements.

"It is the considered view of the United States Government that the ITO proposals provide a useful starting point for the deliberations of this Commission," he said. He also suggested that the FAO Commission might study means by which nations, by consultation and cooperation, could bring into better coordination their individual, national, agricultural, and nutritional programs.

The creation of the Preparatory Commission grew out of a recommendation made by FAO's Special Meeting on Urgent Food Problems held in Washington in May 1946. Although the Special Meeting was concerned with the immediate food emergency, the representatives of the various governments felt that even after 1948 there would still be acute problems, one of which might be the accumulation of surpluses of important agricultural commodities. The Special Meeting requested the Director General of FAO to submit proposals to the next session of the FAO Conference for dealing with such problems.

The *Proposals for a World Food Board*, published by FAO on July 5, 1946, thus took their place on the agenda of the FAO Conference at Copenhagen, which was advanced a month in order to permit the representatives of the member nations to consider the proposals at the earliest possible moment.

At the same time the Conference had to consider other matters of great practical importance, such as admission of new members, budgets and financial controls, constitutional and organizational questions such as relationships to other United Nations agencies, and non-governmental international organizations. The Copenhagen Conference also dealt with the advancement of the technical work of FAO in the fields of agricultural science and education, improvement in nutrition, forestry and fisheries questions, economic and statistical studies, and the work of FAO missions, an activity which had been initiated with a mission for Greece.

Member countries attending the Conference, including those admitted at this session,² were Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile,

¹ The Commission convened at Washington on Oct. 28.

² Those admitted at this session are indicated by an asterisk.

ACTIVITIES AND DEVELOPMENTS

China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary*, Iceland, India, Ireland¹, Italy*, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal*, Switzerland*, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia. In addition, observers were present representing Argentina, Austria, Finland, Rumania, Siam, Sweden, and Turkey.

International governmental organizations represented were the Emergency Economic Committee for Europe, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Emergency Food Council, International Labor Office, International Monetary Fund, Office International des Épizooties, United Nations, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and the World Health Organization.

Four international non-governmental agencies attended the Conference, as follows: International Cooperative Alliance, International Federation of Agricultural Producers, World Federation of Trade Unions, and World Federation of United Nations Associations.

The United States Delegation was headed by Norris E. Dodd, Under Secretary of Agriculture, as U.S. Member, with Leslie A. Wheeler, Director of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, Department of Agriculture, as alternate.¹

The Conference organized its work under three commissions, each with a number of committees. Commission A on technical questions included committees on agriculture, nutrition, forestry, fisheries, economics and statistics, and FAO missions. Mr. Watts of the U.S. Delegation was chairman of the Forestry Committee.

Commission B on administration had committees on constitution, organization, and finance.

Commission C on world food policy was headed by the United States member and had two committees—on the World Food Board proposal and

on the World Food Board appraisal which had been submitted by the FAO Secretariat.

The United States Delegation assigned a spokesman, and in some cases other persons with special representational interests or responsibilities, to each committee and commission. In addition, the United States member served as a member of the General Committee of the Conference, and of the Nominations Committee. Mr. Wheeler was chosen a member of the Executive Committee for a three-year term.

The report of the World Food Board Committee, adopted by the Conference, stated:²

"1. Having examined the Director General's Proposals for a World Food Board in the light of the discussion in the Plenary Meetings, and accepting the general objectives of the Proposals, namely:

"(a) developing and organizing production, distribution and utilization of the basic foods to provide diets on a health standard for the peoples of all countries;

"(b) stabilizing agricultural prices at levels fair to producers and consumers alike."

It is agreed that international machinery is necessary to achieve these objectives and it is recommended that a Preparatory Commission be established to carry the proposals further.

"2. The terms of reference of the Preparatory Commission should cover the following matters: The Director General's Proposals and any alternative proposals which may be submitted to it and to prepare concrete recommendations and propositions for international action for achieving the objectives as set out in paragraph 1."

The accepted committee report, continuing, recommended that the Preparatory Commission be composed of 16 member nations, with invitations extended to Argentina and the U.S.S.R., non-members, and that Siam be invited to join in discussions concerning rice. Any FAO member nation, though not a member of the Preparatory Commission, was to be entitled to send an observer.

The 16 Preparatory Commission member Governments were named as Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia,

(Continued on page 915)

¹ BULLETIN of Aug. 25, 1946, p. 361.

² Document 78, Report of Committee I, Commission C, 2d Sess. of FAO Conference at Copenhagen.

THE RECORD OF THE WEEK

Announcement of Trade-Agreement Negotiations

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION RELATED TO TRADE-AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

[Released to the press November 10]

The Acting Secretary of State on November 9 issued formal notice of intention to conduct trade-agreement negotiations with Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Lebanon (Syro-Lebanese Customs Union), Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and the areas for which these countries have authority to negotiate. Invitations to most of these nations were announced in December 1945. The negotiations will probably begin in April 1947.

The Acting Secretary also made public a list of products which will be considered for the possible granting of tariff concessions by the United States in these negotiations.¹

The Committee for Reciprocity Information simultaneously issued a notice fixing the dates for submission to it of written information and views about the projected negotiations and of applications to appear at public hearings before the Committee. The notice sets forth the time and place for the opening of these hearings.

The announcement marks a further important step in the program of international economic collaboration begun with the Atlantic Charter. This program was expanded in article VII of the our mutual-aid agreements, was carried forward by our participation in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International

Monetary Fund, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. It has been further developed in the United States *Proposals for Expansion of World Trade and Employment* presented last December for the consideration of the governments and peoples of the world. The *Proposals* have since been elaborated in detail in the *Suggested Charter for an International Trade Organization* published by the United States in September of this year.

The British and French Governments have announced their full agreement with all important points of the *Proposals*. The Economic and Social Council of the United Nations has voted to call an international conference on trade and employment, and has appointed a Preparatory Committee to prepare the agenda for that conference.

This Preparatory Committee is now holding its first meeting in London. It has accepted the United States *Suggested Charter* as a basis for study.

To be fully effective, general rules for international commercial and trade relations such as those laid down in the *Suggested Charter* must be supplemented by specific action to reduce, modify, or eliminate barriers to trade such as tariffs, quantitative restrictions, and discriminations. The

¹ Printed in Department of State publication 2672, Commercial Policy Series 96. Refer also to *Schedule A—Statistical Classification of Imports Into the United States*, U. S. Dept. of Commerce, Sept. 1, 1946.

THE RECORD OF THE WEEK

trade-agreement negotiations which the Department has announced are one of the principal means by which the nations now meeting in London (which are the same nations included in the proposed negotiations) will endeavor next spring to achieve this end.

This is the largest reciprocal trade-agreement negotiation yet undertaken. Nations are emerging from the dislocations of the war. They are now making crucial decisions as to the nature and direction of their economic activities. There exists a major opportunity to reduce world trade barriers and establish desirable patterns of future world trade. To seize this opportunity, the trade-agreements program, limited during the war, is now being resumed on a broad scale.

In the past years the United States and the other countries participating in these negotiations have accounted for about two thirds of the world's trade. The other negotiating countries have accounted for about the same proportion of United States exports and imports. The list of products on which public hearings are to be held is therefore extensive and includes a large proportion of the important products in United States import trade, including among them some products of which Germany and Japan were formerly principal sources of United States imports, but of which the negotiating countries are likely to be the principal sources under post-war conditions.

It is intended to include in the proposed trade agreement an adequate escape clause, along the lines of that appearing in our trade agreement with Mexico, under which a concession which, as a result of unforeseen circumstances, causes serious injury to domestic producers, can be modified or withdrawn.

The negotiations will be a two-way process. The United States will make requests for tariff and other concessions by the other countries in favor of a wide range of products covering a large proportion of our total export trade. Although no list of the export items on which concessions will be requested is to be published, the interdepartmental trade-agreements organization is preparing a very extensive list of such requests, and export interests are urged to let the trade-agree-

ments organization know at the public hearings what concessions they feel should be requested of the other countries involved in the negotiations.

Information is also solicited about other trade barriers, such as quantitative restrictions or administrative regulations which have stood in the way of United States export trade with these countries, and as to any discriminations by these countries which have proved detrimental to United States exports.

The procedures hitherto followed under the Trade Agreements Act will continue to apply in the preparation for these negotiations. No tariff concession will be granted by the United States on any product not covered by the present or a supplementary public list. Inclusion of any product in the public list does not necessarily mean that a reduction or binding of duty will be granted. No decision to offer a tariff concession will be made until after the public hearings, and the final decision as to what concessions will be granted will, of course, depend on the outcome of the negotiations. Concessions may take the form of reductions in duty (customs duties and import excise taxes) or may simply bind existing duties or duty-free treatment or processing taxes.

For the convenience of the public, the present list has been prepared in two forms. The first form, entitled *Statistical List*, is based upon the classifications set forth in *Schedule A—Statistical Classification Of Imports Into The United States*, September 1, 1946, published by the Department of Commerce. Its language is commercial rather than statutory and will be more familiar to many of those interested in the proposed negotiations. The second form, entitled *Statutory List*, is based upon the language of the Tariff Act of 1930, and contains the exact legal description of the products on which concessions will be considered. It is controlling.

It has already been announced that public hearings will be held at a date to be announced later on the *Suggested Charter for an International Trade Organization*, so that all interested United States persons and groups will also have an opportunity to express their views as to the general rules under which international trade should be conducted.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

[Released to the press by the White House November 9]

The Acting Secretary of State has today formally announced the intention of this Government to enter into concerted trade-agreement negotiations with eighteen other principal and representative trading nations for the reciprocal reduction of trade barriers and substantial elimination of trade discriminations among the nations participating.

It is important that the people of the United States realize the true significance of these negotiations, for us and for the world. They are not solely trade bargains. They are that; but they are much more. They are central to the structure of international economic cooperation under the United Nations. They are necessary to achieve the objectives of the Atlantic Charter and of Article VII of our mutual-aid agreements. They are necessary to strengthen and support the foundations of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and to pave the way for the kind of economic world envisaged in the *Suggested Charter for an International Trade Organization*.

The substance of the *Suggested Charter* is now being discussed in London by a Committee of nations designated by the Economic and Social Council to prepare for an International Conference on Trade and Employment and for the establishment of an International Trade Organization. The subsequent trade-agreement negotiations announced today will carry forward these general principles and objectives by concrete and specific action to clear the channels of trade, replacing trade warfare by trade cooperation to the common benefit of all countries. Their success or failure will largely determine whether the world will move towards a system of liberal international trade, free from arbitrary barriers, excessive tariffs, and discriminations, or will pay the heavy costs of narrow economic nationalism.

I am confident that the people of the United States will give these negotiations their full support and encouragement.

PUBLIC NOTICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE¹

[Released to the press November 10]

Pursuant to section 4 of an act of Congress approved June 12, 1934, entitled "An Act to Amend the Tariff Act of 1930", as extended and amended by Public Law 130, 79th Congress, approved July 5, 1945 (48 Stat. 945, 59 Stat. 411; 19 U.S.C. Supp. V, 1354), and to Executive Order 6750, of June 27, 1934, as amended by Executive Order 9647, of October 25, 1945 (3 CFR, 1945 Supp., ch. II), I hereby give notice of intention to conduct trade-agreement negotiations with Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Lebanon (including negotiations on behalf of the Syro-Lebanese Customs Union), Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Union of South Africa, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom, including areas in respect of which these countries have authority to conduct trade-agreement negotiations.

All presentations of information and views in writing and applications for supplemental oral presentation of views with respect to such negotiations should be submitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Information in accordance with the announcement of this date issued by that Committee concerning the manner and dates for the submission of briefs and applications, and the time and place set for public hearings.

DEAN ACHESON

Acting Secretary of State

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
November 9, 1946.

PUBLIC NOTICE OF THE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

[Released to the press November 10]

Closing date for submission of briefs, December 21, 1946. Closing date for application to be heard, December 21, 1946. Public hearings open, January 13, 1947.

¹ 11 Federal Register 13447.

THE RECORD OF THE WEEK

Submission of Information to Committee for Reciprocity Information

The Committee for Reciprocity Information hereby gives notice that all information and views in writing, and all applications for supplemental oral presentation of views, in regard to the trade-agreement negotiations with the countries listed above¹ (including areas for which these countries have authority to conduct trade-agreement negotiations), in respect of which notice of intention to negotiate has been issued by the Acting Secretary of State on this date, shall be submitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Information not later than 12 o'clock noon, Saturday, December 21, 1946. The Committee office will remain open to receive these briefs.

Such communications should be addressed to "The Chairman, Committee for Reciprocity Information, Tariff Commission Building, Eighth and E Streets, Northwest, Washington 25, D.C."

Public hearings will be held before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, at which supplemental oral statements will be heard. The first hearing will be at 10:00 a.m. on January 13, 1947, in the Department of Commerce Auditorium in the Department of Commerce Building at 14th and E Streets, Northwest, Washington, D.C. Witnesses who make application to be heard will be advised regarding the time and place of their individual appearances.

Ten copies of written statements, either type-written or printed, shall be submitted, of which one copy shall be sworn to. Appearances at hearings before the Committee may be made only by or on behalf of those persons who have filed written statements and who have within the time prescribed made written application for supplemental oral presentation of views. Statements made at the public hearings shall be under oath.

Persons or groups interested in import products may present to the Committee their views concerning possible tariff concessions by the

¹ The countries listed were: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Lebanon (Syro-Lebanese Customs Union), Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Union of South Africa, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom.

United States on any product, whether or not included in the list of *Products On Which Possible Tariff Concessions Will Be Considered In Reciprocal Trade Agreement Negotiations* made public by the Acting Secretary of State on this date. However, no tariff concession will be considered on any product which is not included in that list or in a supplementary public list.

Persons interested in export items may present their views regarding any tariff or other concessions that might be requested of the foreign governments with which negotiations are being conducted.

Views concerning general provisions of a nature customarily included in trade agreements may also be presented.

By direction of the Committee for Reciprocity Information this 9th day of November, 1946.

EDWARD YARDLEY
Secretary

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
November 9, 1946.

U. S.-U. K. Discussions on Bizonal Arrangements For Germany

[Released to the press November 9]

The Department of State announced on November 5 that discussions will take place in Washington, beginning on November 12, between representatives of the British and United States Governments on certain financial and economic questions related to the bizonal arrangements between the British and American zones of Germany.

The United States will be represented by the Departments of State and War, with assistance on particular issues from other governmental agencies such as the Treasury and Commerce Departments and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Lt. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, Deputy Military Governor of the American zone of occupation, is expected to arrive in Washington from Berlin in time to participate in the discussions.

The British Government is sending to Washington a group of experts to assist the Embassy in the discussions, including Lieutenant General Robertson, Deputy Military Governor of the British zone of occupation, Germany, and repre-

(Continued on next page)

A National Bipartisan Program for Foreign Affairs

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT¹

I shall devote all my energy to the discharge of my duty with a full realization of the responsibility which results from the present state of affairs. I do not claim for myself and my associates greater devotion to the welfare of our Nation than I ascribe to others of another party. We take the same oath of office. We have at one time or another been equally willing to offer our lives in the defense of our country. I shall proceed, therefore, in the belief that the members of the Congress will discharge their duties with a full realization of their responsibility.

Inevitably, issues will arise between the President and the Congress. When this occurs, we must examine our respective positions with stern and critical analysis to exclude any attempt to tamper with the public interest in order to achieve personal or partisan advantage.

The change in the majority in the Congress does not alter our domestic or foreign interests or problems. In foreign affairs we have a well-charted course to follow. Our foreign policy has been developed and executed on a bipartisan basis. I have done my best to strengthen and extend this practice. Members of both parties in and out of the Congress have participated in the inner council in preparing and in actually carrying out the foreign policies of our Government. It has been a national and not a party program. It will continue to be a national program insofar as the Secretary of State and I are concerned. I firmly believe that our Republican colleagues who have

worked intelligently and cooperatively with us in the past will do so in the future.

My concern is not about those in either party who know the seriousness of the problems which confront us in our foreign affairs. Those who share great problems are united and not divided by them. My concern is lest any in either party should seek in this field an opportunity to achieve personal notoriety or partisan advantage by exploitation of the sensational or by the mere creation of controversy.

We are set upon a hard course. An effort by either the executive or the legislative branch of the Government to embarrass the other for partisan gain would bring frustration to our country. To follow the course with honor to ourselves and with benefit to our country, we must look beyond and above ourselves and our party interests for the true bearing.

As President of the United States I am guided by a simple formula: to do in all cases, from day to day, without regard to narrow political considerations, what seems to me to be best for the welfare of all our people. Our search for that welfare must always be based upon a progressive concept of government.

I shall cooperate in every proper manner with members of the Congress, and my hope and prayer is that this spirit of cooperation will be reciprocated.

To them, one and all, I pledge faith with faith, and promise to meet good-will with good-will.

Letters of Credence

AMBASSADOR OF CANADA

The newly appointed Ambassador of Canada, Humphrey Hume Wrong, presented his credentials to the President on November 8. For texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release 792 of November 8, 1946.

Bizonal Arrangements—Continued from page 910

sentatives of the Foreign Office, Control Office for Germany and Austria, and Treasury.

The discussions will be exclusively concerned with financial and economic aspects of the bizonal arrangements which have not been worked out in Berlin or which require governmental approval.

¹ Excerpts from a statement made to press and radio correspondents at the White House on November 11, 1946 and released to the press on the same date.

U. S. Position on Polish Nationalization Developments

[Released to the press November 9]

Text of a note of October 30, 1946 on nationalization, delivered by Gerald Keith, counselor of the United States Embassy in Poland, to the Polish Foreign Office, October 31

I have the honor to inform Your Excellency that I have been instructed by my Government to communicate to Your Excellency's Government the following observations relative to the steps which have recently been taken by the Provisional Government of National Unity with a view to implementing the provisions of the law of January 3, 1946, regarding the nationalization of the basic branches of the Polish national economy.¹

1. The Government of the United States desired to recall to the Government of Poland the provisions of numbered paragraphs 4 and 5 of the notes exchanged between the two Governments at Washington on April 24, 1946, which specifically provide: (a) that the Government of the United States and the Provisional Government of Poland will make both adequate and effective compensation to nationals and corporations of the other country whose properties are requisitioned or nationalized, and (b) that the Provisional Government of Poland and the Government of the United States agree to afford each other adequate opportunity for consultation concerning the subjects touched upon in the exchange of notes, and including that mentioned under (a) above.²

2. The Government of the United States desires once again to bring to the attention of the Provisional Government of National Unity the inadequateness of the time allowed in paragraph 28 of the order of the Council of Ministers of April 11, 1946, for foreigners to protest the nationalization of their property or to file claims under articles 2 and 3 of the nationalization law, especially in view of the provisions to be found in paragraph 75 of the order of April 11, 1946, which require the foreign firm or person concerned to choose a place

of residence within Polish territory for the receipt of official documents or to appoint an attorney with residence in Poland and in view of the fact that many weeks will unavoidably be required to identify and notify persons or firms in the United States owning or having an interest in undertakings in Poland affected by the Polish Government's nationalization program.

3. The Government of the United States desires to point out that the Polish Government has not yet announced the procedure to be followed in the processing of claims for compensation in the case of properties destined for nationalization in accordance with the provisions of article 3 of the nationalization law of January 3, 1946. The Government of the United States wishes in this connection to bring again to the attention of the Provisional Government of National Unity the fact that foreign persons and firms, whose interests are affected by the operation of the nationalization law of January 3, 1946, will require sufficient time and the accordance of adequate facilities to enable them to prepare and to present their claims for compensation, once definite notice of expropriation is received. The Government of the United States feels certain that the Polish Government will agree that a proper valuation can, in most instances, only be determined after a thorough examination of the property in question, and that to prepare the data necessary to such a proper valuation, adequate time is needed for the actual physical examination of the property, together with complete freedom of access to all of the plans and records. The Government of the United States desires to emphasize the reasonableness of its views in this respect, and to insist upon the granting of all examination privileges which the representatives of the American interests affected may find necessary to enable them to arrive at a proper valuation of the property concerned.

4. The Government of the United States refers to the proposal contained in the note of January 17, 1946, from its Embassy in Warsaw relative to the establishment of a mixed commission, com-

¹ For an article on the Polish Nationalization Law see BULLETIN of Oct. 13, 1946, p. 651.

² BULLETIN of May 5, 1946, p. 761.

American Mission to Albania Withdrawn

[Released to the press November 8]

The proposal made by the United States Government on November 10, 1945 to recognize the Albanian regime headed by Col. Gen. Enver Hoxha specified as a condition that the Albanian authorities affirm the continuing validity of all treaties and agreements in force between the United States and Albania as of April 7, 1939, the date of the Italian invasion of Albania. The requirement of such an assurance from the Albanian regime as a prerequisite to United States recognition is in accord with the established practice of this Government to extend recognition only to those Governments which have expressed willingness to fulfil their international obligations. The Albanian regime on August 13, 1946, after a delay of nine months, indicated its acceptance of the multilateral treaties and agreements to which both the United States and Albania are parties, but it has failed to affirm its recognition of the validity of bilateral instruments between the United States and Albania.

In view of the continued unwillingness of the present Albanian regime to assume these bilateral commitments and obligations, which are in no instance of an onerous character and concern such customary subjects as arbitration and conciliation, naturalization, extradition, and most-favored-nation treatment (see the appended list), the United States Government has concluded that the American Mission can no longer serve any useful purpose by remaining in Albania. This decision has been notified to General Hoxha by the Acting American Representative in Tirana, George D. Henderson, in a letter of November 5, the text of which is as follows:

Since arriving in Tirana on May 8, 1945 to survey conditions in Albania in connection with the question of United States recognition of the existing Albanian regime, the informal United States Mission has sought to bring about mutual understanding and the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Governments of the United States and Albania. Despite United States en-

posed of an equal number of representatives of each Government, with a view to reaching a decision concerning which assets, of those subject to nationalization under the provisions of the nationalization law of January 3, 1946, are owned by nationals of the United States, the amount of the compensation to be paid for each such holding nationalized by the Government of Poland, the means by which the compensation is to be paid, and concerning such related matters as may mutually be agreed upon between the two Governments. The Government of the United States wishes to reiterate the proposal contained in the note of January 17, 1946, to which reference has just been made, and to state that it regards it as of the greatest importance that the mixed commission be appointed at an early date to the end that agreements may be reached in principle on the various subjects within its competence before properties in which there is an American interest have been nationalized. The Government of the United States recalls that, in the note which the Polish Embassy in Washington addressed to the Department of State on April 24, 1946, the Polish Government expressed its willingness to begin discussions such as those referred to in the note addressed to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs by the American Embassy in Warsaw on January 17, 1946, although it held that the time for such discussions was then somewhat premature.¹ The Government of the United States, in the light of the steps recently taken by the Polish Government looking toward the realization of its nationalization program, feels that the Provisional Government of National Unity may, since April of 1946, have made such progress in its reconstruction planning that the holding of such discussions as those proposed in the note of January 17, 1946, may now be regarded as opportune. I should be grateful if Your Excellency would be so good as to inform me as soon as may be possible, in view of the urgency of the matter under discussion, of the views of the Polish Government with respect to the observations contained herein so that I may, in turn, inform my Government in Washington.

I avail [etc.]

¹ BULLETIN of Apr. 21, 1946, p. 670.

THE RECORD OF THE WEEK

deavors in this regard, and in the absence of a satisfactory response from the Albanian Government to the offer of recognition which was tendered by the United States Government in November 1945, the Mission has been unable to achieve the purposes for which it was originally sent to Albania.

In the circumstances, although my Government retains its sentiment of warm friendship for the Albanian people, it does not feel that there is any further reason for the Mission to remain in Albania. The United States Mission is accordingly being withdrawn.

Bilateral Treaties and Agreements Between the United States and Albania

Arbitration treaty

Signed at Washington, Oct. 22, 1928. Ratifications exchanged Feb. 12, 1929; proclaimed Feb. 12, 1929. Effective Feb. 12, 1929.

Conciliation treaty

Signed at Washington, Oct. 22, 1928. Ratifications exchanged Feb. 12, 1929; proclaimed Feb. 12, 1929. Effective Feb. 12, 1929.

Naturalization treaty

Signed at Tirana, Apr. 5, 1932. Ratifications exchanged July 22, 1935; proclaimed July 29, 1935. Effective July 22, 1935.

Extradition treaty

Signed at Tirana, Mar. 1, 1933. Ratifications exchanged Nov. 14, 1935; proclaimed Nov. 19, 1935. Effective Nov. 14, 1935.

Agreement relating to most-favored-nation treatment and other matters

Signed at Tirana, June 23 and 25, 1922. Effective July 28, 1922.

Agreement effected by exchange of notes for the waiver of passport visa fees for non-immigrants

Signed at Tirana, May 7, 1926. Effective June 1, 1926.

Money order convention

Signed Apr. 13 and June 18, 1932. Effective July 1, 1933.

¹ BULLETIN of Nov. 3, 1946, p. 826.

Provisions for Payment of National Solidarity Tax on American Assets in France

[Released to the press November 7, 1946]

Text of statement released in Paris on November 7, 1946 by Jefferson Caffery, American Ambassador to France

In pursuance of conversations between officials of the French Government and those of the American Embassy, the French Minister of Finance has made the following decision regarding the national solidarity tax (tax on enrichment tax)."

"1. American citizens, domiciled outside of France, have until December 31, 1946 in which to file their declarations for the impost of national solidarity, and until February 28, 1947 in which to pay the first two installments regardless of the date on which they receive their tax bills.

"2. American assets in France, which by their nature would have been transferable under the terms of *avis* numbers 35 and 53 of the Ministry of Finance but which had not been transferred on June 4, 1945 owing to circumstances beyond the control of the creditors, will not be subject to the impost of national solidarity (capital levy and enrichment tax)."

The two *avis* mentioned in the preceding paragraph appeared respectively in the *Journal Officiel* of April 15, 1945 and of October 5, 1945.

Immigration Visas for Estonian Refugees

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

[Released to the press by the White House November 21, 1946]

On October 24 I announced that I had directed that all avenues be explored toward enabling the 48 Estonian refugees who recently entered the United States without immigration visas to remain here, if they so desired, so that they might eventually become citizens of this country.¹

I am pleased to announce that as a result of the joint efforts of the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, these refugees will definitely not be deported and will in due course be given immigration visas which will enable them to remain in this country.

Property Tax on Czechoslovak Holdings

[Released to the press November 8]

The Department of State has been informed by the American Embassy at Praha that the Czechoslovak capital levy and war profits tax, on the increase in the value of property between January 1, 1939 and November 15, 1945, imposed by law no. 134 of May 15, 1946, has been declared effective September 30, 1946. Tax returns must be submitted prior to November 30, 1946.

On the basis of the information currently available, the Department understands that United States citizens owning real estate, commercial enterprises, currency, bank accounts, securities, insurance policies, valuable metals, precious stones, jewelry, objects of art, antiques, and coin, stamp, and other collections, located in Czechoslovakia should file returns in the tax district in which the property is located. The law now requires returns also to be filed by United States citizens who hold claims in Czechoslovakia. Such claims may arise in connection with confiscation of property during the occupation as a result of racial or other legislation, war damage to property, nationalization of property by the Czechoslovak Government, patent rights, and insurance policies.

The Department suggests that all United States citizens holding such property or claims who have authorized agents in Czechoslovakia communicate with such agents immediately to insure that the returns will be filed for them by the latter and that those who do not have agents in Czechoslovakia make arrangements immediately for the filing of such returns.

Radio Broadcast on UNESCO

On November 9 the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, William Benton, and the deputy chairman of the American delegation to the General Conference of UNESCO, Archibald MacLeish, discussed with Sterling Fisher, director of the NBC University of the Air, the question, "Can UNESCO Help To Prevent a Third World War?" This program was one in a series entitled "Our Foreign Policy", presented by NBC. For a complete text of the radio program, see Department of State press release 799 of November 9, 1946.

Duncan Wall—Continued from page 908

Denmark, Egypt, France, India, the Netherlands, the Republic of the Philippines, Poland, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

In addition, the Economic and Social Council was invited to send two representatives, one to speak especially for the ITO Preparatory Commission, and the following specialized intergovernmental agencies one representative each: International Labor Organization, World Health Organization, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Monetary Fund. These agency representatives were not to be entitled to vote, but to participate in discussions as advisers.

The Preparatory Commission was directed to make its report to the Director General, to be circulated to member governments of FAO and to international agencies concerned. Then the report is to be considered by an FAO Conference, and passed on with the FAO recommendations to the United Nations through appropriate channels.

Formally opening the Conference, His Majesty, King Christian X, of Denmark, said: "I wish the leaders and delegates of this Conference every success in meeting the great difficulties and tasks which face them, in order that this Conference may contribute to mutual understanding among nations, to the progress of mankind, and to the improvement of the life of all who are suffering from hunger and want."

In the closing session of the Conference, Sir John Boyd Orr, Director General of FAO, said, "I am sure that all members of the delegations will go away from this Conference feeling that a beacon light in international relations, illuminating afresh the common objectives of the United Nations, has been shed from here."

Agriculture in the Americas

The following article of interest to readers of the BULLETIN appeared in the December issue of *Agriculture in the Americas*, a publication of the Department of Agriculture, copies of which may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, for 10 cents each:

"Pineapples in Northeast Brazil", by Bentley B. Mackay, agricultural adviser, American Consulate, Pernambuco (Recife), Brazil.

United States Exports of Housing Materials

BY PAUL H. NITZE¹

Many people believe that large quantities of housing materials, particularly lumber, are being exported from the United States to the detriment of the Veterans Emergency Housing Program. I am grateful, therefore, to the American Legion and to its special Committee on Housing for this opportunity to correct this impression.

Before discussing the exports of building materials in detail, I should like to make some general observations.

The United States entered the war and emerged from the war with the conviction that the American system of free enterprise was indispensable and that American leadership in working for economic health in the rest of the world was essential to our continued security.

An active and large export trade is indispensable in carrying out these policies. If exports were prohibited, we could hardly expect to obtain from foreign countries the many commodities in which the United States is deficient and which we need for our industry. This country certainly could not achieve or maintain high levels of income and employment or continuing prosperity without an active and large international trade. Our aims, both before and since the war, in the field of commercial policy have been to promote as vigorously as possible an expansion of world trade and employment through the reduction of those barriers and discriminations which developed in the period before the war and still threaten.

Although this country is notably well equipped with natural resources and production facilities of most kinds, we nevertheless depend upon heavy importations for a great many materials basic in our industrial structure. Everyone knows that in the United States we do not have resources of tin.

¹ Address made before the National Housing Conference of the American Legion in Washington on Nov. 7 and released to the press on the same date. Mr. Nitze is Acting Director, Office of International Trade Policy, Department of State.

Everyone knows that we do not produce natural rubber. What is often overlooked is that a number of materials are needed in our industry—needed even in the construction of houses—which, although produced to some extent in the United States, are not produced in adequate quantities to satisfy all our needs. I have in mind commodities such as copper of which we shall have to import something like one fourth to one third of our total consumption. I have in mind asbestos of which we must import the preponderance of our consumption. I have in mind lead which at present is in short supply everywhere and of which again we must import a very substantial part of our total consumption. I have in mind even lumber, about which I shall have more to say later, which we have imported and must continue to import in considerable quantities. I have in mind nickel, not produced at all in the United States but indispensable in the manufacture of a thousand and one items used in the construction of houses and household equipment. One could go on with this kind of listing. One could add various other basic industrial materials, also. One could add such foodstuffs as coffee, sugar, cocoa, and even pepper. What I am emphasizing is the importance of international trade in maintaining active industry and adequate provisions for consumers in this country.

Veterans need housing. There is no question but that the present need is particularly acute while we are still in the transition from war to peace. That need has been recognized by the government to a greater extent than any other immediate post-war need. Measures taken in order to promote the availability of materials needed for the production of houses have been vigorous. We have recognized the need to provide for a housing program in our policy with respect to trade controls. The Department of State, as a matter of broad policy, recognizes that during the emergency period of transition to a full peacetime economy

nearly all nations occasionally may have to employ controls over items in short supply to facilitate reconstruction and rehabilitation. A recent presidential proclamation suspends the duty on certain housing materials made from lumber during the housing emergency. Also, there have been in effect for some time export controls over materials and products needed for the carrying out of the Veterans Emergency Housing Program.

Exports of housing materials are limited by agreement between the National Housing Agency, Civilian Production Administration, and the Department of Commerce. The three agencies acting in consultation determine what the export quota shall be for a particular housing item. The Department of Commerce then issues export licenses within the limits of the export quota. All applications for export licenses are screened carefully by the Department of Commerce. The end use of each item is scrutinized and the size of each shipment considered. The total foreign request for United States lumber in 1945 was 1 billion, 200 million board feet. This request was scaled down in the screening process and only 395 million board feet were actually exported—about one third of the quantity requested. We feel that exports have been limited to an irreducible minimum.

Exports of lumber, one of the principal materials used in housing, are being limited in 1946 to 600 million board feet, or less than 2 percent of the total production in the United States, which is expected to be 33 billion board feet. Approximately twice as much lumber was exported per year in the pre-war years 1935 to 1939 as is now exported.

Exports of housing materials other than lumber are small, also, in comparison with domestic production. Exports of bathtubs are being restricted in 1946 to 1.7 percent of domestic production; closet bowls and water closets, 3.6 percent; asbestos roofing, 1 percent; gypsum board and lath, 0.4 percent; stoves, 2.2 percent; furnaces, 0.5 percent; nails, 2.3 percent; linoleum, 1 percent; and standard portland cement, 1.6 percent. Figures for practically all housing items show that exports are small compared with domestic production.

How do exports of housing items compare with exports of other items? Whereas exports of hous-

ing items generally amount to less than 3 percent of the housing items produced, total exports amount to 9 percent of the domestic production of all movable goods in the United States.

Despite the foregoing, you may ask, "Why export any building materials?" I anticipated this question in my preliminary remarks, and I shall elaborate it further here.

The United States imports from two to three times as much lumber as it exports. In 1945 the United States imported more than 1 billion board feet of lumber and exported only 395 million board feet. Most of our lumber imports came from Canada which is also one of our chief countries of destination for lumber exports.

Of the 395 million board feet of lumber exported in 1945, approximately 30 to 35 percent was softwood in timber sizes. These timbers are made principally by tidewater mills on the Pacific Coast and generally the mills are not equipped to make other kinds of lumber. The timbers are not normally used in home construction but, instead, are exported for use in heavy construction such as port facilities, railroads, shipbuilding, mining, petroleum, and other forms of industrial construction.

Another 30 percent of the 1945 exports was hardwood lumber. Only a small part of this hardwood was suitable for use in housing.

Thus, the balance, or only from 30 to 40 percent of the United States exports of lumber in 1945, was suitable for housing, whereas from 70 to 75 percent of the lumber imported was satisfactory for this use.

The construction of a one-family frame house requires an average of 14,000 board feet of lumber. On this basis, in 1945, we had a net import of the lumber equivalent of 44,000 houses.

If the United States restricted further the exports of lumber or other building materials, it might bring retaliation from other countries. This country cannot afford to jeopardize its imports. It should be borne in mind that imports of many materials used in housing are substantial, such as logs, lumber, plywood, shingles, copper, nickel, asbestos, and lead.

The United States is obliged to share its scarce commodities with the other American republics and Canada for the duration of the war emergency. During the war, Canada and the Ameri-

THE RECORD OF THE WEEK

can republics signed international agreements at Hyde Park, Mexico City, and Rio de Janeiro by which they committed themselves to share scarce items with each other.¹ This country fulfils its obligations, and it has not forgotten that during the conflict many of the countries south of our borders supplied us with rubber for use in tires on ordnance vehicles; Ecuador supplied us with balsa wood for use in airplanes and life jackets; several countries supplied us with mahogany for use in P-T boats; Mexico supplied us with lead for use in aviation gasoline, bullets, and batteries; Bolivia supplied us with tin for use in food containers; Brazil supplied us with quartz crystals for use in radios; and Canada supplied us with lumber for use in Army camps and shipyards, asbestos fiber for use in brake linings and clutch facings on ordnance vehicles, and nickel for use in projectiles and armor plate.

Limited quantities of housing materials are exported to Europe and the Orient for use in reconstruction and rehabilitation. These shipments are made in accordance with the President's announced policy of assisting these areas. Available information indicates that the war-devastated countries of Europe will receive from all sources only 53 percent of their 1946 lumber requirements. The quantity of lumber which these countries will receive will be only 45 percent of the quantities that they received in 1937. The United States, on the other hand, with no war devastation, will have more lumber available in 1946 for its own use than in any of the pre-war years, 1935-1939 inclusive. In 1937, a peak year, the United States had 28 billion board feet of lumber available for its own use, compared with an expected 33 billion board feet in 1946. These figures are arrived at by adding imports to domestic production and then deducting exports. Thus, the United States in 1946 should have available for its own use about 120 percent of the quantity which it had in 1937, compared with 45 percent for the European countries previously mentioned.

To sum up, the facts clearly indicate that the

¹ BULLETIN of Apr. 26, 1941, p. 494; *Report of the Delegation of the United States of America to the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace* (Department of State publication 2497, Conference Series); BULLETIN of Feb. 7, 1942, p. 117.

volume of exports of housing materials is extremely small. Exports represent the rock bottom minimum of building materials needed to meet the requirements of foreign countries. Further curtailment of exports is likely to be detrimental rather than helpful to the Veterans Emergency Housing Program. In periods of shortage such as we are now passing through, our refusal to sell to other countries the things they badly need may result in a decrease in the imports of the materials we want for our domestic program.

I know that you veterans are not building for today alone. You have your eyes on the future. When you keep your eye steadily on the thing that you want your Government to do in order to make a better and more peaceful world to live in, you see that the issue we are discussing today broadens and merges into the terms on which we can trade all kinds of goods with all countries. We all want to build an economic world of increasing production, of full employment, and of high levels of world trade. That is the kind of world this Government is trying to bring about by its economic foreign policy.

Commerce Over Alaska Highway Authorized

[Released to the press November 7]

It was announced on November 7 in Washington and Ottawa that authorization has been given for the shipment of goods in bond from points in the United States to points in Alaska, and from points in Alaska to points in the United States over the Alaska Highway and connecting roads. This action has been taken in implementation of undertakings of the Canadian Government which were made at the time authorization was given to the United States Government to construct the Alaska Highway.

Although construction of the Alaska Highway system, including the so-called Haines Cut-off, was undertaken solely for military reasons, its post-war utility for civilian traffic was foreseen, and provision was made for the use of the system by United States traffic on the same terms as Canadian traffic. The United States, by an exchange of notes of March 17-18, 1942, agreed that at the conclusion of the war that part of the Highway which

ies in Canada should become in all respects an integral part of the Canadian Highway system.¹ In return, Canada agreed that United States civilian traffic could use the Alaska Highway on the same conditions as Canadian traffic and undertook specifically "to waive import duties, transit, or similar charges on shipments originating in the United States and to be transported over the Highway to Alaska or originating in Alaska and to be transported over the Highway to the United States".

By a further exchange of notes of November 28-December 7, 1942, it was agreed that the so-called Haines Cut-off should be considered an integral part of the Alaska Highway and in all applicable respects subject to the agreement reached in the exchange of notes of March 17-18, 1942.² There was a further and clarifying exchange of letters of April 10, 1943, which assured United States civilian traffic adequate access to the southern terminus of the Alaska Highway.³ The post-war rights made available to the United States civilian traffic under these exchanges of notes have not previously been made available, as the road has continued to be a military highway not open to general public use. The Canadian military authorities, continuing the practice inaugurated by the United States military authorities during the war period, have heretofore permitted civilian traffic by individual permit only, and only where such traffic was able to proceed with the limited facilities available along the route. Under these regulations United States civilian traffic has been permitted on the same terms as Canadian traffic.

The Alaska Highway system is not now in a condition which would permit general civilian traffic and it is not anticipated that it will be possible to use the road without restriction for some time to come. However, the Canadian Government has been taking active measures to improve and increase facilities along the Highway, and as the situation has improved it has permitted increased traffic. The action now taken in authorizing—so far as facilities are available—transit-in-bond of goods originating in the United States and to be transported over the Highway to Alaska or originating in Alaska and to be transported over the Highway to the United States, is taken in

anticipation of the time when the facilities on the Highway will be such as to warrant opening the road to general civilian traffic.

Suitable regulations for shipment of goods in bond on the Highway will be issued as a matter of course by the Minister of National Revenue of Canada. The following Canadian frontier ports of entry and exit have been designated: Kingsgate, British Columbia, opposite Eastport, Idaho; Coutts, Alberta, opposite Sweetgrass, Montana; and Snag Creek, Yukon Territory.

With further improvement of the Alaska Highway and connecting roads, consideration will be given in the future to the designation of further Canadian ports of entry and exit as conditions warrant.

Special Ambassador to Mexican Presidential Inauguration

[Released to the press November 7]

President Truman has appointed as Special Ambassador for the inauguration of the new President of Mexico on December 1, Walter Thurston, Ambassador of the United States to Mexico. On December 1 President-elect Miguel Alemán is to be inaugurated as the new President of Mexico, to serve for a period of six years. Ambassador Thurston will be the head of the official mission which will represent the United States at the inauguration. The mission will comprise the following persons: Walter Thurston, Special Ambassador; Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright, Commander of the Fourth Army at Fort Sam Houston; Lt. Gen. John K. Cannon, Commander of the Army Air Forces at Barksdale Field, Louisiana; Rear Admiral J. Cary Jones, U. S. N., representative of the United States on the Joint Mexican-United States Defense Board; and Guy Ray, Chief of the Division of Mexican Affairs, Department of State. The mission will probably also include the political counselor, the economic counselor, and the first secretary of the American Embassy at Mexico City.

As a gesture of respect and friendship for the Mexican people, the War Department plans to

¹ Executive Agreement Series 246.

² Executive Agreement Series 382.

³ Executive Agreement Series 362.

THE RECORD OF THE WEEK

send on the occasion of the forthcoming inauguration in Mexico City an air-demonstration group which will include squadrons of each of the following types of planes: Shooting Stars, Mustang fighters, and attack bombers.

The Navy Department also plans to send four squadrons which will be composed of about 36 two-motor planes to take part in the inauguration. Both these Army and Navy planes will arrive at Mexico City not later than November 30 and will probably remain through December 4, when the officers and members of the crews will take part in ceremonies to be arranged by the Mexican military authorities.

The Mexican Ambassador in Washington has expressed to the Department of State, on behalf of his Government, appreciation of the gesture of the War and Navy Departments in sending these planes to Mexico City for the inauguration.

Caribbean Commission and Auxiliary Bodies Established

[Released to the press by the Caribbean Commission, Secretary-General's Office, October 30]

An agreement for the establishment of the Caribbean Commission was signed at the Department of State on October 30 on behalf of the Governments of France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The agreement was signed for France by Henri Bonnet, Ambassador of France; for the Netherlands by Dr. A. Loudon, Ambassador of the Netherlands; for the United Kingdom by Lord Inverchapel, British Ambassador; and for the United States by Charles W. Taussig, Chairman, United States Section, Caribbean Commission.

The agreement formally establishes the Caribbean Commission, together with its auxiliary bodies, the Caribbean Research Council and the West Indian Conference, as an international advisory body to the four signatory Governments, each of which has territories in the Caribbean area.

The agreement provides for the establishment of a permanent secretariat in the Caribbean area. Following the formulation of the terms of the agreement in July 1946, Lawrence W. Cramer was appointed Secretary-General. Two other senior

members of his staff also have been appointed, and further staff is being recruited in the Caribbean area. A suitable building has been acquired in Port-of-Spain, Trinidad, to accommodate the secretariat.

The purposes of the agreement are set forth in the preamble, which reads in part as follows:

Being desirous of encouraging and strengthening cooperation among themselves and their territories with a view toward improving the economic and social well-being of the peoples of those territories, and

Being desirous of promoting scientific, technological, and economic development in the Caribbean area and facilitating the use of resources and concerted treatment of mutual problems, avoiding duplication in the work of existing research agencies, surveying needs, ascertaining what research has been done, facilitating research on a cooperative basis, and recommending further research and

Having decided to associate themselves in the work heretofore undertaken by the Anglo-American Caribbean Commission, and

Having agreed that the objectives herein set forth are in accord with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

Pan American Union Elects Chairman of Governing Board

[Released to the press November 7]

The annual elections for chairman and vice chairman of the Governing Board of the Pan American Union were held at the regular meeting of November 6. Before the Mexico City conference in 1945, the permanent chairman had been the United States Secretary of State. Resolution IX of Mexico City provided that the chairman should be elected annually and should not be eligible for immediate reelection. A subsequent Governing Board decision provided that elections for both chairman and vice chairman should be held at the first meeting in November of every year, that there should be no nominations, that the ballot should be secret, and that a two-thirds majority should be required for election. Failing a two-thirds majority, however, a special meeting of the

Governing Board would be held at which a simple majority would suffice.

The November 6 elections were the first held under the new rules. On the first ballot, the Honorable Spruille Braden, United States Assistant Secretary of State, was elected by a vote of 17 to 1 (18 members being present and voting and Mr. Braden casting his vote for the representative of Colombia). Mr. Braden, expressing his gratitude for the honor, nevertheless stated to the Board upon the conclusion of this election that he felt obliged to decline it having in mind the basic principle of sovereign equality before the law among the American republics, which had been given expression at Mexico City in the decision to provide for rotation of the chairmanship. He pointed out that until very recently his Government had enjoyed the honor of the chairmanship. Consequently, he felt that in the spirit of Mexico City the election should go to some other member of the Board. As a consequence, another vote was taken at which Dr. Antonio Rocha, Special Ambassador of Colombia to the Pan American Union, was elected chairman by a vote of 17 to 1. No vice chairman was elected in view of the failure of any candidate to receive the necessary two-thirds majority.

Joint American-Philippine Financial Commission

[Released to the press November 4]

The Department of State announced on November 4 that President Truman and President Roxas had agreed to establish a joint American-Philippine Financial Commission to study the financial and budgetary problems and needs of the Philippine Government.

The Joint Commission will consider the entire range of Philippine budgetary and financial problems and report its findings and recommendations to both the United States and Philippine Governments.

Under the terms of the agreement, the Commission will consist of three Americans and three Filipinos to be appointed by the respective heads of Government.¹ There will be two co-chairmen, a Filipino and an American. The American membership is expected to be composed of a representa-

tative of the State Department, a representative of the Treasury Department, and a representative of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. The Commission will do its work primarily in Manila.

President Roxas stated that he was very happy to welcome this further evidence of the interest of the United States Government in the welfare of the Philippines.

THE CONGRESS

Problems of American Small Business: Hearings Before the Special Committee To Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises, United States Senate, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, pursuant to S. Res. 28 (79th Congress) (Extending S. Res. 298—76th Congress), a resolution to appoint a special committee to study and survey problems of American small business enterprises. Part 95, World Food Supplies in Relation to Small Business: IV, June 14 and 15, 1946. v, 101 pp. [Department of State, pp. 10771-10775].

Pearl Harbor Attack: Hearings Before the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack, Congress of the United States, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, pursuant to S. Con. Res. 27 (as extended by S. Con. Res. 49, 79th Congress), a concurrent resolution authorizing an investigation of the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and events and circumstances relating thereto. In 39 parts.

International Abolition of Conscription: Hearings Before the Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, on H. Res. 325, a resolution urging an immediate international agreement to eliminate compulsory military service from the policies and practices of all nations. February 27 and 28, 1946. iii, 83 pp.

Accounting Practices of the War Shipping Administration and United States Maritime Commission: Hearings Before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, pursuant to the authority of H. Res. 38, a resolution authorizing an investigation of the national defense program as it relates to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Part 1, July 17, 22, and 24, 1946. iii, 455 pp.

International Court of Justice. Senate Resolution 196 as passed by the Senate on August 2, 1946, together with the Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations submitted by Mr. Thomas of Utah on July 25, 1946 relative to proposed acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction of International Court of Justice by United States Government. Presented by Mr. Thomas of Utah, August 2 (legislative day, July 29), 1946. S. Doc. 259, 79th Cong. 13 pp.

¹ Concluded by an exchange of notes on Sept. 13 and 17, 1946 at Manila.

Publications

of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

The United Nations Conference on International Organization. San Francisco, California, April 25-June 26, 1945. Selected Documents. Conference Series 83. Pub. 2490. 992 pp. \$2.75 (buckram).

Documents of the San Francisco conference of general interest, including a section on amendments to and comments on the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals, verbatim minutes of plenary sessions, reports of committees, and literal prints of final documents.

Transition From League of Nations to United Nations. Article by Henry Reiff. United States-United Nations Information Series 5. Pub. 2542. 18 pp. 10¢.

An article outlining the transfer to the United Nations of functions, activities and assets of the League of Nations. Texts of documents are given in the appendix.

The United Nations for Peace and World Progress. United States-United Nations Information Series 9. Pub. 2503. Poster. Free.

Shows the organization and goals of the United Nations.

Organizing the United Nations. A series of articles from the *Department of State Bulletin*. United States-United Nations Information Series 6. Pub. 2573. 57 pp. 25¢.

An address by John G. Winant, U. S. Member of the Economic and Social Council, and articles by officers of the Department of State on political, economic, social, and legal functions of the United Nations and its organs.

The Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. The United States and the United Nations Report Series 3. Pub. 2600. 74 pp. 20¢.

Report to the Secretary of State by John G. Winant, U. S. Member on the Council, July 15, 1946. Includes background information on the Council, a discussion of its functions, and reports of its commissions.

Foreign Affairs Outline No. 6—Understanding Among Peoples—How Can We Increase It? United States-United Nations Information Series 8. Pub. 2589. 4 pp. Free.

An explanation of what the United Nations and the United States are doing for the advancement of understanding among peoples.

Foreign Affairs Outline No. 7—The International Trade Organization—How Will It Work? Commercial Policy Series 92. Pub. 2597. 8 pp. Free.

An explanation of the U. S. *Proposals for Expansion of World Trade and Employment*. With charts illustrating U. S. foreign economic policy and the purposes of the proposed international trade organization.

Foreign Affairs Outline No. 8—Goals for the United Nations—Political and Security. United States-United Nations Information Series 10. Pub. 2623. 4 pp. Free.

An explanation of what has been done and what remains to be done for the attainment of political stability and international security.

Foreign Affairs Outline No. 9—Goals for the United Nations—Economic and Social. United States-United Nations Information Series 11. Pub. 2631. 4 pp. Free.

Outlining the goals for the upbuilding of economic and social conditions among nations.

Guide to the United States and the United Nations (Coverpiece for Foreign Affairs Outlines 8 and 9). United States-United Nations Information Series 12. Pub. 2634. 8 pp. Free.

A chronology of the relation of the United States to the United Nations. With charts, list of officials, and bibliography.

Foreign Affairs Outline No. 10—Occupation—Why? What? Where? Pub. 2627. 4 pp. Free.

An explanation of U. S. occupation of defeated and liberated countries as a part of our foreign policy.

Foreign Affairs Outline No. 11—What We Are Doing in Germany—And Why. European Series 14. Pub. 2621. 4 pp. Free.

A definition of U. S. policy in occupied Germany and a description of current problems.

Foreign Affairs Outline No. 12—What We Are Doing in Japan—And Why. Far Eastern Series 15. Pub. 2633. 4 pp. Free.

Demilitarization and democratization listed as the objectives of the U. S. and its Allies in occupied Japan.

Activities of the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation, June 30, 1946. Inter-American Series 31. Pub. 2622. 45 pp. 15¢.

A report on the background and current activities of the Committee in its cooperation with the governments of the other American republics.

Suggested Charter for an International Trade Organization of the United Nations. September 1946. Commercial Policy Series 93. Pub. 2598. 47 pp. 15¢.

THE RECORD OF THE WEEK

Trade Policy
An elaboration of the United States *Proposals for Expansion of World Trade and Employment* prepared by a technical staff within the Government of the United States and presented as a basis for public discussion.

New Horizons for World Trade. Commercial Policy Series 90. Pub. 2591. 12 pp. Free.

A discussion of the four basic problems of international trade dealt with in the U.S. *Proposals for Expansion of World Trade and Employment*.

Building a New World Economy. Commercial Policy Series 94. Pub. 2618. 10 pp. Free.

An account of U.S. foreign economic policy, aiming to expand and liberalize trade throughout the world.

International Trade and the British Loan. Commercial Policy Series 91. Pub. 2595. 10 pp. 10¢.

A group of eight charts with annotations.

Private Enterprise in the Development of the Americas. Inter-American Series 32. Pub. 2640. 14 pp. 10¢.

Address by Assistant Secretary Braden on the participation of U.S. private enterprise in the development of the other American republics.

Statement of U.S. Policy on Germany. Address by the Secretary of State. Delivered in Stuttgart, Germany, September 6, 1946. European Series 13. Pub. 2616. 5 pp. 5¢.

The Distribution of Reparation From Germany. The Paris Agreement on Reparation from Germany; the Inter-Allied Reparation Agency; the Final Act of the Paris Conference on Reparation. European Series 12. Pub. 2584. 10 pp. 10¢.

Includes articles by John B. Howard, Special Adviser to James W. Angell, U.S. Representative on the Allied Commission on Reparations for Germany and U.S. Delegate to the Paris Conference on Reparation.

The Present Status of German Youth. By Henry J. Gellermann. European Series 11. Pub. 2583. 25 pp. 10¢.

A description of the problems of German youth after the collapse and the policies pursued by the several occupying powers in meeting these problems.

Report of United States Education Mission to Japan. Far Eastern Series 11. Pub. 2579. 62 pp. 20¢.

Summary of report submitted to General MacArthur, SCAP. Covers child and adult education and teacher training and recommends a drastic reform of the Japanese written language.

Trail of Japanese War Criminals. Documents: (1) Open Statement by Joseph B. Keenan, Chief of Counsel, (2) Charter of the International Military Tribunal for the Far

East, (3) Indictment. Far Eastern Series 12. Pub. 2613. 104 pp. 20¢.

The Textile Mission to Japan—Report to the War Department and to the Department of State, January–March 1946. Far Eastern Series 13. Pub. 2619. 39 pp. 15¢.

A survey of Japan's textile capacity and operational problems. With tables.

Report of the Mission on Japanese Combines. Part I. Analytical and Technical Data. Far Eastern Series 14. Pub. 2628. Processed material. 230 pp. 75¢.

Report to Department of State and War Department concerning the oligarchy (Zaibatsu) which controlled the economic structure of Japan.

Provisional Administration of Venezia Giulia. Agreement Between the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Yugoslavia—Signed at Belgrade June 9, 1945. Executive Agreement Series 501. Pub. 2562. 2 pp. 5¢.

Agreement on the area in Venezia Giulia to be under the command and control of the Supreme Allied Commander, and provisions for administration. With map.

Voluntary War Relief During World War II. A Report to the President by the President's War Relief Control Board. Pub. 2566. 73 pp. 15¢.

An account of the activities of the President's War Relief Control Board from July 1942 to May 1946. With a tabulation of contributions collected and disbursed from September 1930 to December 1945.

Report of the West Indian Conference, Second Session, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands, United States of America, February 21 to March 13, 1946. Conference Series 88. Pub. 2615. 86 pp. Free.

Reports of committees and texts of principal addresses.

8th Report to Congress on Operations of UNRRA. Under the Act of March 28, 1944. As of June 30, 1946. Pub. 2617. 68 pp. 15¢.

The President's letter of transmittal to Congress and quarterly report. The appendixes contain tables on (1) the U. S. contribution and (2) over-all UNRRA operations.

Foreign Service List, July 1, 1946. Pub. 2629. 151 pp. Subscription price 50¢ a year, 65¢ foreign; single copy 20¢.

A quarterly list of officers in the American Foreign Service, their classification and assignment as of July 1, 1946. With a description of consular districts and tariff of U. S. Foreign Service fees.

A cumulative list of the publications of the Department of State, from Oct. 1, 1929 to July 1, 1946 (Pub. 2609), may be obtained from the Department of State.

Contents

General Policy

A National Bipartisan Program for Foreign Affairs. Statement by the President	911
Letters of Credence: Ambassador of Canada. Immigration Visas for Estonian Refugees. Statement by the President	914
Special Ambassador to Mexican Presidential Inauguration	919
Pan American Union Elects Chairman of Governing Board	920

Economic Affairs

Private International Air Law Developments. Article by Stephen Latchford	879
Meeting of Interim Commission of WHO	893
U.S. Delegation to CITEJA	894
U.S. Delegation to International Wool Talks	894
Twenty Governments Invited to International Whaling Conference	895
Third Meeting of the Rubber Study Group	895
Tourist Conference Revives International Cooperation in Travel	896
Paul T. David Appointed to PICAQ Committee	897
Caribbean Regional Air Navigational Meeting of PICAQ. An article.	897
PICAQ Conference on North Atlantic Ocean Weather Observation Stations. Article by J. Paul Barringer	901
International Action on Agricultural and Nutrition Problems: FAO Copenhagen Conference and FAO Preparatory Commission. Article by Duncan Wall	905
U. S. Position on Polish Nationalization Developments	912
Provisions for Payment of National Solidarity Tax on American Assets in France	914
Property Tax on Czechoslovak Holdings	915
United States Exports of Housing Materials. By Paul H. Nitze	916

The United Nations

International Control of Dangerous Drugs. Article by George A. Morlock	885
U.S. Members on ECOSOC Commissions	891
American Advisers to General Conference of UNESCO	894
Radio Broadcast on UNESCO	915

Occupation Matters

U.S.-U.K. Discussions on Bizonal Arrangements for Germany	910
---	-----

International Organizations and Conferences

Calendar of Meetings	892
--------------------------------	-----

Treaty Information

Draft Trusteeship Agreement for the Japanese Mandated Islands:	
Statement by President Truman	889
Text of Draft Agreement	889
Announcement of Trade-Agreement Negotiations:	
Summary of Information Related to Trade-Agreements Program	907
Statement by the President	909
Public Notice of the Department of State	909
Public Notice of the Committee for Reciprocity Information	909
American Mission to Albania Withdrawn	913
Commerce Over Alaska Highway Authorized	918
Caribbean Commission and Auxiliary Bodies Established	920
Joint American-Philippine Financial Commission	921

Publications

Agriculture in the Americas	915
Publications of the Department of State	922

The Congress	921
------------------------	-----